FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 083 *28 April 1980*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

West Reneging on Earlier Pledges at MBFR Talks AA 1
[Boykov in NOVOYE VREMYA no 15]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Ponomarev Heads Delegation to Meeting of Communist Parties BB 1
CPSU Delegation Arrives in Paris BB 1
Opening of Conference BB 1
Cypriot CP Leader Interviewed on European Conference [Bogomaz] BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Sobolev, Kovalev, Kondrashov]
Gromyko Visit to France CC 1
Hostages Rescue Attempt CC 2
EEC Sanctions Against Iran CC 2
Paris Communist Parties Conference CC 3
Afghan Revolution Anniversary CC 5
Olympic Boycott CC 6
U.S. Presidential Primaries CC 6
Iranian, PLO UN Envoys Assail U.S. Rescue Attempt CC 8
Leninist Foundations Insure Soviet Foreign Policy Success CC 9
[Sanakoyev in PRAVDA 21 Apr]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Vance Resigns Over Disagreement on Rescue Attempt A 1
Further on Resignation A 1
Druzhinin Report A 1
Continuing Comment, Reaction to Aborted Hostage Rescue Mission A 2
Carter's TV Address A 2
U.S. Reaction A 3
Church Criticizes Decision A 4
Press Reaction A 4
Goncharov: Danger to Allies A 5
Repeat Action Possible A 7
Bulantsev: 'Bandit Sally' A 7
Details of Plan; 'Secret' Force A 8
Vasilyev: 'Recklessness Must End' [PRAVDA 26 Apr] A 10
Orlov Comment A 11
Gerasichev: Public's Reaction A 13
Attempt To Carry Off Iranians A 14
Attempt To Conceal Facts [Kachanov] A 14
Naval Presence Off Iran Being Built Up A 14

CHINA

Western Economic Cooperation Leads to Imperialistic Reliance B 1
[Sidorov in EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 15]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japan 'Hostage of Washington's Adventuristic Policy' C 1
Importance of Cooperation in Mongolian Agriculture Reviewed C 1
[Maydar in IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]

SOUTH ASIA

Zimyanin-Led Delegation Arrives in Kabul D 1
Meeting With Karmal D 1
Reportage on Second Anniversary of Afghan Revolution D 1
Karmal Address D 1
Zimyanin Address D 5
Military Parade, Concert D 8
Soviet Delegation's Departure D 9
Moscow Meeting Marks Afghan Revolution Anniversary D 10
[IZVESTIYA 24 Apr]
Kapitonov Attends Daneshjo Reception D 10
Press Conference by Afghan Counterrevolutionary Leader Cited D 10
Ziaul Haq Refuses Normalization Talks With Afghanistan D 11
[Korolev]

WESTERN EUROPE

Gromyko Discusses Iran, Afghanistan at Paris Press Conference G 1
Gromyko Arrives Home from Visit to France G 8
Reportage, Comment on Reaction to U.S. Rescue Attempt G 8
Protests in 'Political Circles' G 8
Goncharov on Allies' Position G 9
Implications for Turkey G 10
UK Prepared To Send Military Force to Persian Gulf G 10

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Khomeyni Calls U.S. Rescue Mission 'Foolish Attempt' H 1
Hostages Fate Described H 1
'Display Vigilance, Mobilize' H 1
Qotzbadeh Denunciation of U.S. Attack Quoted H 2
'Criminal Actions' Condemned H 2
Bani-Sadr Comments at Tehran Press Conference H 3
Bodies of Dead To Be Returned H 3
Call for Nonaligned Help H 3
Muslim Students Statement Issued in Tehran H 3
Hostages Moved From Embassy H 4
Iranian Ambassador Warns of Consequences of Action H 4
Army Division in Khuzestan Put on Alert H 4
Moscow Persian Comments on Hostage Rescue Attempt H 4
Savchenko: 'Adventurism' in Iran H 5
People of Tehran Express 'Indignation' at Raid H 7
U.S. 'Rescue' Planes Took Off From Egyptian Airport H 7

WEST RENEGING ON EARLIER PLEDGES AT MBFR TALKS

LD250929 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 15, 11 Apr 80 pp 10-11

[V. Boykov article: "Who Is Torpedoing the Talks"]

[Text] "I urge the Soviet Union to declare finally its readiness to conduct talks on disarmament and arms control with the West from realistic positions.... I make an urgent appeal...for a response to our earnest disarmament proposals dictated by profound concern for peace throughout the world." If we are to believe the author of these words--FRG Foreign Minister H.D. Genscher--the West is forcing the pace of military detente while the USSR is torpedoing it. But people believe facts, not words.

For 7 years the United States delayed concluding the SALT II treaty. And when this document was finally signed, the White House first surrendered it to be torn to pieces by "hawks" and then shelved it. Approximately 1 month ago J. Carter declared in general: If it comes to light during consultations with Congress that SALT II is not in the U.S. national interest, the USSR will be notified that "the terms of the treaty are no longer observed." It was not Moscow but Washington that curtailed the talks on limiting military activity in the Indian Ocean and that is now demonstrating "gunboat diplomacy" there. For more than a year now the Americans have been postponing the resumption of the Soviet-American dialogue on limiting the arms trade. And things are not much better regarding the solution of a number of other problems of military detente.

The 20th round of the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe ended recently. The Vienna debate has now lasted more than 6 years. However, it has still not been possible to make any progress. Who is to blame for this?

The date 8 June 1978 could have been a turning point at the Vienna talks. On that day the USSR and its allies put forward a comprehensive proposal which took into consideration a number of important elements in the West's position. The socialist countries declared that they were prepared to move toward meeting the [negotiating] partners' wishes and to establish equal overall ceilings for the strength of the NATO and Warsaw Pact armed forces (at 900,000 men, including 700,000 ground forces personnel). They also agreed that only ground forces would be reduced, while the air force personnel strength would be limited. All this was not only in accordance with the NATO idea of "collective ceilings" but also created preconditions for ending the protracted discussion of the size of the sides' military contingents in the region of reduction, for limits were thus set on the size of the armed forces. The socialist countries also adopted a proposal that only the USSR and the United States would reduce their troops at the first stage, followed by the other countries directly involved in the talks. Finally, the Warsaw Pact states expressed their readiness to withdraw from the region of reduction a considerable quantity of military hardware, including 1,000 tanks, on condition that the West reduced its arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons and delivery systems by a corresponding number of units. Thus the NATO scheme of "Eastern tanks for Western tactical nuclear weapons" was also being adopted.

These proposals, as many politicians and experts of NATO countries even admitted, took the Western viewpoint into consideration more than had been expected. FRG Chancellor H. Schmidt, for example, described the initiative of the USSR and its partners as "a considerable basis for achieving the aim of the Vienna talks." But how did the West respond to this? It stayed silent for 18 months. Finally at the end of last year, along with the decision to deploy approximately 600 medium-range missiles in Europe, NATO announced its "new peace initiative." This initiative was discussed during the 20th round of the Vienna talks. After it ended, Soviet delegation head N.K. Tarasov declared: The Western proposals do not help to draw the participants' viewpoints any closer. Moreover, NATO has renounced the accords already agreed, canceling out the results of 6 years' work.

The North Atlantic bloc now refuses to discuss the question of any reductions of armaments and combat hardware whatever. It has removed from the agenda even its own proposal to evacuate nuclear ammunition and delivery vehicles in exchange for a withdrawal of a certain number of Soviet tanks. At the same time the USSR and its allies believe that an agreement to reduce military confrontation in Europe can only be effective if it provides for a reduction of arms, including nuclear arms.

The West is now reducing virtually the whole business to a reduction in the strength of Soviet and American ground forces alone by 30,000 and 13,000 men respectively. But is this really a serious proposal? It is not simply that they are demanding more of one side than the other is prepared to do. The USSR and its allies have not increased their troop strengths in central Europe during the talks. On the contrary, at the end of last year the Soviet Union began withdrawing from the GDR 20,000 of its servicemen, 1,000 tanks and a certain quantity of other combat hardware, but as for NATO, it is constantly building up its military contingent. The evacuation of 13,000 Americans does not even cover the increase in the U.S. Armed Forces in the central part of Europe. The number of American troops in the FRG alone has increased by almost 30,000 men over the past 4 years alone.

In December 1978 the North Atlantic bloc agreed to guarantee that, after the USSR and the United States have reduced their military contingents, the FRG, Britain and other Western countries would follow their example. Now the position has changed: NATO is refusing not only to reduce but even to "freeze" the present level of these states' armed forces. And yet these make up three-fourthes of the bloc's troops in central Europe.

Questions of monitoring observance of future accords occupy a significant place in the Western side's recent proposals. The USSR and its allies also favor strict control. But it must accord fully [dolzhen byt adekvaten] with the scale of reductions in the sides' military potential. Yet NATO, agreeing only to an insignificant reduction in ground forces in central Europe, is demanding that the zone of control include not only the central part of the continent but also the territory of Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and the western regions of the Soviet Union. This NATO proposal resembles a plan to gather information on the Warsaw Pact armed forces rather than a verification of the agreement's terms.

Without adducing any proof, NATO is continuing to insist that the socialist countries have the advantage in central Europe in terms of personnel. Therefore, during the 20th round the USSR and its allies put forward a proposal to exchange data on the troop strengths of the states directly involved in the talks as of 1 January 1980. So far, however, no reply to this initiative has been forthcoming.

An analysis of the Western initiative attests that it in no way "increases the chance" of success in Vienna, as J. Carter maintained in his January message to Congress. It is a further attempt to outdo the partner. But this is a fruitless task. It is possible to reach agreement only on the basis of equality and by observing the principle of undiminished security for each of the sides. It is hard to find in the NATO proposals the "profound concern for peace throughout the world" of which H. D. Genscher spoke. For what the West is proposing is not disarmament but a fiction camouflaging an arms race.

PONOMAREV HEADS DELEGATION TO MEETING OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

LD271421 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Apr 80

[Text] A CPSU delegation led by Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Paris today. The delegation will participate in the meeting of communist and workers parties of Europe for peace and disarmament. The delegation includes Zagladin and Rakhamanin, candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chiefs of departments of the party's Central Committee. The delegation was seen off at the airport by Gorbachev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, and other officials.

CPSU Delegation Arrives in Paris

LD271712 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 27 Apr 80

[Text] Paris, April 27, TASS--A CPSU delegation headed by Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived here today. The CPSU delegation will take part in the meeting of the communist and workers' parties of Europe for peace and disarmament.

Opening of Conference

LD280820 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 28 Apr 80

[Text] Paris, April 28, TASS--A meeting of European communist and workers parties for peace and disarmament opened here today. It will last for two days. The CPSU delegation is led by Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

CYPRIOT CP LEADER INTERVIEWED ON EUROPEAN CONFERENCE

LD242230 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 24 Apr 80

[Text] Nicosia, April 24, TASS--By TASS correspondent A. Bogomaz: The conference of the European communist and workers' parties for peace and disarmament, to be held in Paris, has a considerable importance not only for the European Continent, but the world as a whole, Ezekias Papaioannou, general secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL), told TASS. The conference will be held in an atmosphere when the United States, supported by other imperialist countries and the treacherous Chinese leadership, has started its policy of undermining the process of detente and returning to the cold war and the arms race, pushing mankind to the verge of nuclear catastrophe, said Ezekias Papaioannou. He also noted that the imperialists started this policy long before the events in Afghanistan. The Pentagon and NATO began the development of a broad programme of modernization and building up their weapons long ago. Under the U.S. pressure, the NATO session took a decision to start the production and deploy new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The Pentagon has formed a rapid deployment force of 100,000 troops for armed interventions, particularly in the oil-producing countries.

In these conditions the forthcoming conference of the communist and workers parties, concluded Ezekias Papaioannou, acquires a particularly great importance for peace and detente.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD271710 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 27 Apr 80

["International Observers' Roundtable" program with Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, commentator of the international section of the all-union radio; Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev, international journalist; and Stanislav Nikolayevich Kondrashov, IZVESTIYA political observer]

[Text] [Sobolev] Greetings comrades. USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko visited France this week.

Gromyko Visit to France

The Paris press wrote in connection with the visit of the Soviet minister that both the visitor and the French would share at least two words: detente and dialogue. The world press noted the importance of the political consultations between the two countries for the cause of peace and international cooperation. Newspapers, L'HUMANITE in particular, stressed that holding this meeting as scheduled was very important since Atlantic circles are exerting pressure in order to worsen Soviet-French relations.

[Kovalev] The talks in Paris between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and the French leaders were conducted, as the communique says, in a friendly atmosphere. The evaluation of the talks which Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko gave at his press conference in Paris was positive. The two sides were genuinely convinced that the Soviet foreign minister's visit to Paris, as well as the talks held there, were necessary and useful.

The outline plans for trade and economic links between France and the USSR, envisaged in the document signed last year by President Valery Giscard d'Estaing of France and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, are being successfully implemented. They are even being overfulfilled. Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko also said at his press conference that at the given moment talks are being conducted between representatives of France and the Soviet Union concerning the possibility of concluding new, very important contracts.

[Sobolev] In this connection, forgive me, I shall interrupt you, Eduard Vasilyevich; I should like to cite the data of the Vienna Institute of International and Economic Comparisons. This data is interesting in that it shows that the Washington administration's attempts to worsen economic relations between the socialist and capitalist countries have in effect produced no concrete results. Moreover, according to the figures of the institute, which analyzed world foreign trade for 1979 and forecast its development for the current year, the 1980 trade turnover between socialist and capitalist countries will increase in absolute indices by 3 to 4 percent. As far as value is concerned, taking into consideration the rise in prices, exports to the socialist countries from Western countries will increase by 13 percent. Imports from the socialist countries to the Western countries will increase by 18 percent.

[Kovalev] Yes, as far as the international situation is concerned, a large number of questions concerning the international state of affairs were touched upon in the course of the talks in Paris. The two sides, unfortunately, had to note that the international situation has become more complicated. However, in order to successfully overcome these difficulties one has to correctly understand the causes which brought about the complication of the present international situation. When discussing this question the views of our foreign minister and the French leaders were in many respects identical. But, of course, there were also points on which their views did not coincide. Nonetheless, the talks were conducted in a business-like and friendly atmosphere.

The two sides analyzed the causes of and tried to find explanations for the actual state of affairs. The Soviet side would like to have achieved a greater identity of views of the sides. One may note that the French Government also would like there to have been yet greater agreement so that on the issues of foreign policy the basis for cooperation between our two countries might be broadened. As far as the military aspects of security and disarmament in Europe are concerned in particular, the USSR and France expressed the wish that agreement be reached at the Madrid meeting about the aims, content and procedure for holding an appropriate conference.

[Sobolev] During Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's press conference in Paris, the following question was asked: By the way, it was the first question. That morning the Americans reported that they had carried out an attempt to free, with the help of a group of landing troops, the hostage diplomats in Tehran. Andrey Andreyevich Gromyo was asked to comment on this event. The Soviet minister said that at first, when he first heard about it, he simply could not believe it. What can I say, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyo said. I can say that we are against any military action and any action using force, by the United States or by anyone at all against Iran. We decisively condemn such actions.

Hostages Rescue Attempt

Well, indeed, one can say that indeed it was difficult to believe this report at first. The military significance of this action is indeed not very great, the more so since it resulted in failure. The losses were relatively inconsiderable and were suffered by the aggressors themselves. But the political significance of the White House adventure deserves serious analysis.

[Kondrashov] This ill-fated military operation represents something of a culmination of the policy pursued by the White House during the course of the American-Iranian conflict. In my opinion, it proves that, pursuing a policy even more rash and adventurist than one would have expected, Carter is indeed ready to go to any lengths to gain his ends. Just try to imagine what would have happened if the operation had not been called off at the very beginning. Just how many victims would there have been in Tehran--including casualties among the hostages? The hostages, one might say, would have been placed in the shoes of condemned men--but this was of course being done in their own interests.

Who benefits from all this? It would appear that there are people in America who think they need this--people who count on acquiring political capital even at the expense of other peoples' lives. But the question is: Will they in fact gain or lose?

EEC Sanctions Against Iran

[Sobolev] An event took place this week which is directly related both to American-Iranian relations and relations between the United States and its European allies. At the beginning of the week the nine EEC foreign ministers met in Brussels. Their chief and most controversial issue was the position to be adopted on the anti-Iranian sanctions which had already been introduced--in fact twice this month--by the American President. Stanislav Nikolayevich, maybe you can share your thoughts on this question?

[Kondrashov] The question is by no means academic. In America they are actively spreading the story that the Soviet Union allegedly wants to cut West Europe off from its main ally, patron and protector, that is, from the United States; but in actual fact, the American administration would like to induce West Europe to quarrel with the Soviet Union--and not only with the Soviet Union but with such an important nonaligned country as Iran, which is now going through a stormy stage in its revolution.

The Americans have already demanded that their allies sever diplomatic relations with Tehran, introduce, in Americans wake, an economic embargo, and ban all trade and economic links with Iran. The point here is that the lever of American sanctions is not very effective by itself. During the year following the overthrow of the shah's regime, the export of the U.S. goods to Iran diminished by over 50 times, and in February, for example, it amounted to the rather microscopic sum of $1.6 million. You can't defeat Iran using such a lever. That is why Washington decided to use a more powerful lever: West Europe, and Japan as well, which have maintained considerable economic links with Iran. This question had an important political aspect for President Carter, who is engaged in the struggle for reelection. Finally, there was an element of blackmail, which was noticed by many observers. President Carter and his adviser, Brzezinski, were openly saying that if the allies did not submit and did not join the American sanctions, then America would be left with only one option: military action against Iran. In purely economic terms, military actions could cut West Europe and Japan off, not only from Iran, but also from other Persian Gulf countries. By the way, everyone knows West Europe gets two-thirds of its oil there and Japan, three-fourths. This is how America was persuading its friends and allies--by threats.

[Sobolev] Well, did it convince them or not? It seems to me that the answer to this question is still not quite clear. The press, as well as officials of various countries, responded in various ways to the results of the Luxembourg meeting. One group says that the Nine has surrendered by submitting to the American order to follow in its anti-Iranian steps, while others suggest that the Luxembourg decision is not quite so simple. What is your opinion, Stanislav Nikolayevich?

[Kondrashov] I adhere to the latter point of view--that the decision is by no means a simple one. At first glance, of course, there is full solidarity. But in actual fact the American tactic of armtwisting was answered by a West European tactic of deferment and delay in an attempt to gain time and evade a very nasty situation.

The resolution on Iran adopted by the Nine, when you consider it, all turns on the words "without delay." But the gestures that the Nine are making "without delay" are purely symbolic: reducing the number of their diplomats accredited in Tehran and of Iranian diplomats in West European capitals to a minimum; introduction of a visa system for Iranian citizens; barring the sale of arms or military equipment--which in one way or another has been barred before now anyway. As for the main issue--that of the economic embargo--a practical decision on this will only be made in 3 weeks, on 17 May, at a further meeting of the Nine. It must be said that a new element has now entered the situation, one whose consequences are not immediately apparent. I refer to the ill-fated American operation to rescue the hostages, which rescued no one but killed a number of people instead. It is now clear that Washington unceremoniously used its allies as a cover for the preparation of this adventurist action. I think this new episode will be no help at all in easing the tension in relations between the Atlantic partners.

[Sobolev] This action once again gives people living in West Europe cause to reflect on just where Washington is trying to lead them. European security remains a problem of prime importance.

Paris Communist Parties Conference

The communist and workers' parties are playing a most important part in preserving peace on the European Continent. As you know, comrades, a meeting of representatives of the European communist and workers' parties is due to begin in Paris tomorrow. Its theme will be the preservation of peace, detente and disarmament on the European Continent.

[Kovalev] It must be said that convening a forum like this and holding consultations on the subject of peace in Europe corresponds in the fullest possible way with the vital requirements of the present situation. The communist parties of Poland and France--the parties of two countries with great liberating, antimilitarist and antifascist traditions--are the coauthors of the initiative for the Paris meeting.

It is natural that they should have urgently proposed it, and I think they were absolutely right to do so. Indeed, beginning with the Washington session of NATO back in May 1978, militarist agitation, both across the ocean and in many West European capitals, has been continuing unabated. As is usual in such cases, the decision to produce and deploy various new types of lethal weapons, including the new American medium-range nuclear missile complexes, and the buildup of armed forces, especially armed forces in north and south Europe--all this is being covered up by falsifications about the so-called military threat from the East and the imaginary Soviet peril.

For us, this is nothing new. We remember that the first state of the victorious proletariat, Soviet Russia, stepped into the international arena under the banner of peace. Yet, even at that time, from the very first days of Soviet power, active and unceasing attempts were made to compromise our peace-loving policy. That was precisely the purpose of the fairytale, which Lenin debunked, of a Red militarism that supposedly threatened Europe and Asia. Vladimir Ilich wrote at the time: There are stupid people who are shouting about Red militarism. They are political tricksters who pretend to believe this nonsense. They throw such accusations around, right and left, using the lawyer's ability to concoct false arguments and throw sand in the eyes of the masses.

The peoples of Europe are, indeed, now threatened by a serious danger. Already, in peacetime, the policy of "diktat" in international relations, the policy of strength and of war preparations weighs heavily on the shoulders of the toiling masses. Opinion polls in the European countries conducted during the last few weeks show that more and more people are becoming aware of the mounting danger of war. It's not surprising that in such a situation the communist parties have decided to call the conference in Paris. As everyone knows, the great majority of the communist and workers' parties of Europe will be taking part. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in common with more than 20 other fraternal parties on the Continent, has readily responded to the invitation from the French and Polish comrades to attend the Paris meeting.

But, as we know, some communist parties have decided that their presence at that meeting would be inappropriate. Well, you know, I think the discussion over the preparations for the meeting was to be expected. To understand what it's all about, let's look at the arguments of those who say that a meeting of communists alone, without the participation of representatives of other political forces, could harm the cause of the struggle for peace. I would like to quote something. Listen to this: Of course, there have been a few critics who have not failed to make a fuss just because the communist and workers' parties have decided to gather for a meeting. But why should this event cause surprise? Are not such meetings held from time to time on the initiative of political parties of various persuasions? Those were the words of the general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, speaking at a communist conference in Berlin in 1976. I think they're just as true today.

Here's another argument that the bourgeois press is now trying to throw at communists--that the point of view espressed in Paris will be one-sided. What side do they mean? Clearly, the socialist countries and our country, the Soviet Union.

In other words, communists are being told: If you come out against the deployment of new American missiles in central Europe, if you condemn the decisions of the December session of NATO in Brussels, and if, finally, your opinion coincides with the proposals of the Warsaw Pact countries, that is, with the countries where communist parties are in power; if you agree with the proposals for talks in conditions of parity and equal security of the sides--then you undoubtedly deserve to be condemned as adherents of a "narrow" approach. What then, one wonders, must we do to demonstrate a "broad" approach? Support the rearming of NATO? Or condemn the Soviet Union for its unwillingness to allow the established parity to be disturbed?

It's clear that life constantly forces us to make decisions and make a definitive choice. Such a choice faces us today, and it can be put very simply: Should we come out in favor of a policy of peace or a policy that will unquestionably lead to war? In contrast to the antipeople policy of imperialism stands the resolute defense of peace by the countries of socialism, by the communists, by many of the social democrats, by believers and atheists, and by all people of good will who live in countries with various social systems. Today, all who sincerely desire peace must be one-sided in the positive sense. They must take their stand--decisively, firmly and clearly--on the side of peace and against war.

Of course, what I have said does not mean that the considerations that have been expressed by various communist parties in the process of discussion during the preparations for the conference in Paris are without foundation. It must be said that the idea of preparing a detailed conference on these problems in which all the fraternal parties of Europe would take part without exception is worth considering. Not without interest are the arguments concerning a discussion of a wider range of problems having to do with the maintenance of peace, including those that transcend the boundaries of Europe. But, obviously, if an event of that kind were to be held, the communist parties of other parts of the world would have to participate in it. The CPSU has decided to attend the Paris meeting of communists. True to its Leninist principles and to the decisions of its 25th congress, the CPSU is doing everything in its power to advance the cooperation of communists, all peace-loving forces and of all who adopt a realistic position and who realize the danger of a new war. The Paris meeting will undoubtedly promote such cooperation.

Afghan Revolution Anniversary

[Sobolev] It should be said that the April days are rich in events that show how strong the forces of peace are. Two more events at the end of April are associated with the victory of democratic forces. I refer to the anniversary of the April revolutions in Afghanistan and Portugal. Just 2 years ago today, the April revolution took place in Afghanistan. These 2 years have not been easy for the Afghan people. While the abolition of feudal remnants and the improvement of the economy and of the people's living standard has been in progress the Afghans have also had their problems to solve. They've had to fight against increasing interference in their country's internal affairs by the imperialist countries and the Chinese hegemonists. But, little by little, the tasks of the April revolution are being implemented. This is being facilitated by diverse assistance from the world's progressive forces and the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union. A few days ago the basic principles of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which enshrine the achievements of the Afghan revolutionaries, were adopted.

On the occasion of the anniversary of the April revolution Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and Aleksey Nikolayevich Kosygin sent a telegram of greetings to Babrak Karmal, Afghanistan's leader. In particular, the telegram notes, with a sense of profound satisfaction, that with the victory of the April revolution Soviet-Afghan relations are steadfastly being strengthened and deepened in a spirit of comradeship and revolutionary solidarity on the basis of the treaty of friendship, good neighborliness and cooperation.

Olympic Boycott

Going to other events of the week I should like to note that the struggle between the forces of peace, democracy and progress and the militarist forces of imperialism and hegemonism sometimes assumes a rather unusual form. I think this applies in full measure at the present time to the struggle which has developed over the Olympic games in Moscow. This struggle has not just begun now. Even former President Nixon stated in 1973 that the Olympic games would never be held in Moscow. Nonetheless, as you see, they will be. However, Washington and certain of its allies in the West have not given up their attempts to spoil the international sports festival which is due to be held in Moscow.

[Kovalev] These questions were discussed a few days ago in Lausanne, Switzerland. The world public followed the meeting of the Executive Committee of the International Olympic Committee [IOC] there with great interest and attention. It discussed a report by our organizing committee on preparations for the 1980 Olympiad and matters connected with the holding of the summer Olympics in Moscow. This discussion took place in a atmosphere of pressure from the American administration both on the IOC and also on the governments of America's allies.

You already know that, under pressure from the American President to suit his ambitious policy, certain NATO governments--for example Britain, the FRG and Canada--have also decided to recommend that their Olympic committees refrain from participating in the summer Olympics. Pressure is also being put on athletes by reactionary circles in other capitalist countries. But I should say that IOC President Lord Killanin stressed the determination of the committee to ensure that the Olympic games will be held in Moscow as confirmed during the IOC session at Lake Placid. He said: We have an understanding with Moscow and I do not intend to break it.

Here one should also say that the Olympic movement is also strengthened by the position adopted by the organizers of the Moscow games. It is not fortuitous that the IOC president expressed his gratitude to the 1980 Olympics Organizing Committee for its loyalty to Olympic principles and for its efforts to preserve the Olympic movement and its ideals intact.

[Sobolev] Concerning a possible refusal by certain national Olympic committees to send their teams to the Moscow games, Lord Killanin advised the impatient ones that there is no need to be hasty and reach a conclusion before 24 May when the time for sending in applications expires. At the moment, we can already say that the Moscow Olympics will be sufficiently representative. Whereas 95 states were represented at the last Olympics in Montreal, over 100 countries have already declared their participation in the summer games in Moscow.

U.S. Presidential Primaries

Among the events of the past week we may also note the latest stage in the American preelection marathon, the primaries, in the state of Pennsylvania.

[Kondrashov] The outcome of the Pennsylvania primaries was indeed of interest to many people; the greatest attention was given to yet another bout between the Democratic contenders. This time Kennedy, on whom fortune has not been smiling very much in this preelection season, won. So how convincing was his victory? The senator, by a mere hair's breadth, as they say, edged past the President. Both received 46 percent of the votes of Pennsylvania Democrats, but Kennedy received 94 of this state's delegates to the Democratic National Convention, three more than Carter got.

Kennedy's victory can be explained by a number of factors, primarily, perhaps, by the fact that this time he managed to focus the voters' attention on American domestic issues, above all on domestic economic issues. He frightened the Americans with inflation, rapid price increases and the failures of the Carter administration's economic policy. Until now, President Carter has managed to hide, so to speak, behind the international crisis which he himself has in every way been inflating--behind Afghanistan and Iran.

During times of international crisis the nation should rally around the President, forgetting domestic discord and forgiving him his domestic sins. This is a tradition of American domestic politics. Carter has made full use of it and has even been overdoing it, which is now beginning to have an effect on the present stage of the preelection campaign. One cannot manage to hide the domestic economic sores, and in international affairs the Americans, as is shown by the latest opinion polls, are giving Jimmy Carter an ever lower assessment and returning to their previous opinion of him as a weak leader.

In the Pennsylvania elections the President resorted to his favorite method of linking the election campaign with foreign policy. As you know, he toughened his anti-Iranian sanctions, displaying so-called firmness, or, if you like, thickheadedness, and counted on getting the applause of American chauvinists. I do not think, however, that American chauvinists regarded the attempt to steal the hostages, which ceased to be a secret in such tragicomic circumstances, as a plus. Rather the reverse! Americans will see in its failure yet another humiliation for the United States.

[Sobolev] Well, what could the results of the Pennsylvania primaries signify in terms of a general picture of the preelection struggle?

[Kondrashov] It seems to me that on this point one must be very cautious in making forecasts. Kennedy's victory cannot be qualified as a general breakthrough in his favor. Carter still has a better chance of winning the Democratic race than his opponent, although here I would not leave out the possible political consequences of the scandalously unsuccessful action to free the American hostages in Tehran.

As for the second competing party, the Republican Party, an indisputable advantage in the number of delegates is being maintained by Ronald Reagan, despite the latest victory by George Bush in Pennsylvania.

In general, after Pennsylvania, as before, Americans--who are due to vote on 4 November--are facing a choice between Carter and Reagan. Many people are facing the choice with a sense of despondency and doom. I would like to cite the testimony of just one of these well-known people, George Ball, a former U.S. deputy secretary of state who is now an eminent lawyer, a bourgeois figure and a spokesman for the American establishment. This is what he wrote after a recent trip abroad:

Europe and the Near East, where I have just been, George Ball wrote, regard America as a crazy elephant which has gone astray and is trampling the vegetable gardens. All this would still be tolerable if there was any glimmer of hope. However, our foreign friends do not believe that the November elections will help improve the situation. If the prospect of seeing Carter in the post of U.S. President depresses them, the thought that Reagan could become President simply horrifies them. How does one explain--my French friend asked me--the fact that in a country where there are 20 million able, well-educated and even brilliant citizens the choice of leader comes down to Carter or Reagan? Perhaps you ought to revise your electoral system. I was unable to give him any answer, George Ball writes, but deep in my heart I realized that my friend hit the mark exactly.

That was a fairly lengthy quote, but, I think, it is fairly expressive!

[Sobolev] Yes, indeed, the mood of American voters themselves seems to be very similar to that of the Frenchman whom you have just been quoting. One American newspaper wrote as follows: The voters do not like either Carter or Kennedy, and they prefer the President only because they like Kennedy even less. They have no liking for Reagan, either, but in certain circumstances--the newspaper writes--they might get a thirst for change if only for change itself. Well, there is no doubt that the changes desired by American voters consist of a reduction of international tension and the preservation of detente and peace.

Comrades, May Day is drawing near. Preparing to greet this festival of labor and peace, people throughout the world are stepping up their struggle against the arms race and against the dangerous plans of the militarists for the sake of a peaceful future. The CPSU Central Committee, addressing the peoples of the world in its May Day slogans, calls upon them to step up their struggle against the threat of a new world war and for the reduction of armaments and strengthening detente, and to give a rebuff to the aggressive intrigues by imperialism, hegemonism, militarism and revanchism. These slogans are meeting with the most widespread response.

IRANIAN, PLO UN ENVOYS SCORE ASSAIL U.S. RESCUE ATTEMPT

ID262319 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1639 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Excerpts] New York, 26 April, TASS--Reports on the U.S. military adventure in Iran have been met with profound anxiety in circles at the United Nations. As they note here, the United States crudely violated the sovereignty of that country, defying the fundamental principles and goals of the UN Charter which reject the use of force in international relations. The senseless venture of Washington, which has, moreover, led to loss of human lives, has complicated the resolution of the crisis in relations between the United States and Iran.

At a press conference at the UN Headquarters M. Farhang, Iran's permanent representative to the United Nations, stated that the U.S. Armed Forces carried out an incursion into the territory of his country. Nothing is capable of altering this fact, regardless of any false explanations to which Carter might respond, he underlined. The incursion undertaken by Washington was still further proof of the fact that for the U.S. administration the main aim now lies not in freeing the hostages but in destabilizing the situation in Iran. It is no coincidence that a few days ago Carter spoke about the "danger" that Iran might disintegrate. The U.S. administration is ready to sacrifice the hostages in order to achieve its political aims.

Mr. Farhang noted that the military adventure is evidence that U.S. imperialism is continuing to threaten the Iranian revolution. There is no doubt that the United States is striving to breathe life into the activities of the enemies of the revolution inside the country and beyond its borders. The Iranian representative stressed that the present crisis in relations with the United States is the consequence of the exploitation and humiliation to which U.S. imperialism subjected the Iranian people over more than a quarter of a century. Z. L. at-Tarazi, PLO permanent observer at the United Nations, called the U.S. actions "a terrorist act" of incursion on the territory of a sovereign state and stressed that "there is no justification whatsoever" for it.

Taking account of the world community's very negative reaction to Washington's military adventure, the U.S. Mission at the United Nations made a clumsy attempt to justify it. It sent a letter to the chairman of the Security Council which contains the ridiculous claim that the armed provocation in Iran was carried out within "the legal right of the United States to self-defense."

LENINIST FOUNDATIONS INSURE SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY SUCCESS

LD250855 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 80 p 6

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Prof Sh. Sanakoyev: "Following Lenin's Course"]

[Text] The 20th century may with perfect justification be called the century of the triumph of V.I. Lenin's immortal teaching. The most important events of our era have developed and are continuing to develop under the direct influence of the ideas of Leninism and the achievements of Great October. The process of the world's revolutionary renewal led to the formation of the world community of socialist states, which has become the decisive factor in man's progressive development. Lenin's ideas have exerted influence of colossal scale and depth on the sphere of international relations.

Marxist-Leninists have always viewed questions of war and peace as the central problem of international relations on whose positive solution the prospects for social development and man's destiny depend. In our day this problem has become particularly acute. The existence of nuclear missile weapons has made it even more urgent.

Following the behests of its founder, the Soviet state has throughout its history done everything to eradicate wars and ensure peace for all peoples. The consistency of the USSR's foreign policy can be traced from the moment of the adoption of Lenin's historic Decree on Peace to the peace program elaborated by the 24th and developed by the 25th CPSU congresses and the practical actions to implement it. It may be said without exaggeration that all major foreign policy actions, all important initiatives aimed at preserving international peace and resolving fundamental present-day problems emanate from the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries.

The whole world knows the socialist states' specific steps to normalize the international situation and to create the necessary preconditions for businesslike mutually advantageous cooperation among the states of the two different systems. These steps promoted the fruitful holding of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Final Act adopted on 1 August 1975 at the Helsinki conference has rightly become a reliable basis for stabilizing the situation on our continent and for creating a climate of trust and cooperation among states.

Firmly adhering to the principles and accords elaborated at the all-European conference, the socialist community countries have done and are continuing to do everything incumbent on them to ensure that the positive processes in Europe and throughout the world which have begun to appear continue to develop in order gradually to weaken and then to overcome the antagonism of the two military blocs. It is precisely this goal which was pursued and continues to be pursued by the political actions undertaken by the Warsaw Pact countries since the Helsinki conference. Thus in May of last year they submitted a proposal on the convening of an all-European conference at political level to examine questions of military detente and disarmament in Europe and to discuss and elaborate steps to build confidence among the states and to reduce the concentration and cut back on the armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The USSR suggested discussing the question of medium-range nuclear missile weapons in Europe. However, the NATO countries preferred to decide to produce new types of U.S. weapons of this kind and to additionally deploy them in West Europe, thus destroying the basis for talks on this issue. The socialist countries suggested that all states which took part in the all-European conference conclude a treaty renouncing first use of both nuclear and conventional weapons against each other.

V.I. Lenin believed disarmament to be the ideal of socialism. Socialism is a society of creation in which there are not and cannot be classes or social groups interested in seizing foreign lands, in enslaving peoples and unleashing wars. Militarism and militarist aspirations are alien to socialist society. Our foreign policy and diplomacy are an embodiment of the truly peaceful, constructive nature of the socialist system. Back at the dawn of Soviet power, in 1919, V.I. Lenin said at the Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets that the Soviet socialist state "wants to live in peace with all peoples and to direct all its efforts toward internal building...."

Questions of halting the arms race and disarmament occupy a paramount place in the foreign policy activity of the CPSU and Soviet state. This is borne out by the USSR's initiatives on the most diverse aspects of disarmament, from partial measures in the sphere of both nuclear and conventional armaments to total disarmament. Here special attention is paid to questions of nuclear disarmament since the nuclear missile arms race presents the greatest danger to international peace and the existence of present-day civilization.

The USSR and its allies proceed from the premise that a nuclear missile war can and must be averted and that under present conditions peaceful coexistence among states and a policy of detente are the only sensible policy which has no alternative. The West also acknowledges this. However, merely noting the fact is not enough to eliminate the danger of nuclear catastrophe. A sober consideration of the situation prevailing in the world and a responsible approach to the solution ofinternational problems are needed. In the present international situation the intolerability of the methods and means of imperialist diktat and the danger of a "from a position of strength" policy and of a cold war policy is becoming increasingly obvious. You can scarcely fight for your country's "vital interests" while undermining the foundations of international peace.

In particular, the entry into force of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty signed last year thanks to the persistent efforts of Soviet diplomacy could promote the cause of detente. However, official Washington, now gripped by militarist passions, has chosen another path: It is postponing indefinitely the ratification of this important document.

The sharp political turn recently taken by the U.S. administration and its overt course toward aggravating the world situation and returning to cold war times is leading to the intensification of the military danger. In imposing on the NATO countries the decision to build up military budgets and produce new types of U.S. nuclear missile weapons and deploy them in Europe, Washington is creating an explosive situation on our continent and embarking on the path of further escalation of the nuclear arms race. The creation of the so-called "quick reaction corps"--that instrument of the imperialist "big stick" policy--is one more testimony to the transatlantic militarists' hegemonistic aspirations. The U.S. ruling circles are clearly reluctant to come to terms with the revolutionary changes taking place in various parts of the world.

The attempts by Washington and its NATO allies--hopeless but extremely dangerous to the cause of world peace--to change in their favor the prevailing approximate parity of military forces between East and West and the White House's increasingly aggressive interference in the internal affairs of the peoples of developing countries are engendering mounting criticism even in the United States itself. The U.S. President, TIME magazine notes, "has lost a real conception of his own country and possibly of the world."

The U.S. administration's risky military-political pirouettes are causing definite alarm among the United States' NATO allies. While displaying solidarity with Washington in the struggle against revolutionary and national liberation movements, at the same time they are voicing dissatisfaction in one form or another with the behavior of their senior partner. Evidently the West European capitals are beginning to guess the designs of their transatlantic ally, which is pursuing the goal of disrupting the system of economic and scientific and technical cooperation prevailing in Europe. The public of the West European countries is realizing increasingly the tremendous degree of risk for Western Europe with which the U.S. plan to turn it into a kind of shield for the United States in the event of a nuclear missile conflict, is fraught.

The present U.S. course has met with unconditional approval only in Beijing. Here the coincidence of the aggressive plans and aspirations of Washington and Beijing against world socialism and the revolutionary and liberation movements, and their common desire for hegemonism in international relations have undoubtedly had an effect.

The Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries are firmly and consistently steering a Leninist foreign policy course toward preserving and consolidating world peace, developing all-round cooperation among all states, preserving stability in international relations and intensifying the detente process. They are countering the imperialist "doctrine" of military hysteria and the frenzied arms race with a policy of consistent struggle for peace.

Speaking of the goals and tasks of Leninist foreign policy, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted: "We see it as our international policy's vocation to strengthen the peace which we need in order to build communism and which all socialist countries and the peoples of all states need. That is why we will continue to oppose the policy of aggression and promote the liquidation throughout the world of the conditions engendering aggressive wars."

The strength of the foreign policy of socialism lies in the fact that its scientific foundation is Marxism-Leninism and it is built on the basis of a strict consideration of the natural laws of social developments. Socialist foreign policy accords with the vital interests of all peoples and meets with the support of the world's progressive public. In the words of V.I. Lenin, "The overwhelming majority of the world's population approves our peace policy."

The Soviet states' consistent and principled foreign policy is successfully resolving the tasks which the present international situation sets our country. Any changes in the world situation are fully considered in the practical implementation of the Soviet Union's foreign policy course. The Soviet Union combines the resolute rebuffing of the imperialist forces' aspiration to stoke international tension and their attempts once again to cast the world back to the brink of cold war with unvarying readiness to seek and find ways of resolving urgent international problems on the basis of a consideration of mutual interests on the basis of just and democratic principles. The guarantee of the successes of Soviet foreign policy has always been and will be the fact that it unconditionally follows the behests of the great Lenin.

VANCE RESIGNS OVER DISAGREEMENT ON RESCUE ATTEMPT

LD280544 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0532 GMT 28 Apr 80

[Text] Washington, 28 April, TASS--U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, who did not agree with the carrying out of the military adventure in Iran, has sent in his resignation. As radio and television stations have reported here, "there has not as yet been any official confirmation of Vance's resignation."

Further on Resignation

LD281130 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1024 GMT 28 Apr 80

[Text] New York, 28 Apr, TASS--AP, referring to officials of the American administration, has reported that Secretary of State C. Vance announced his resignation because of his disagreement with the recent U.S. military advanture in Iran. It is expected that his resignation will be officially announced this afternoon.

The agency notes that Vance has for a long time expressed disagreement with the conduct of U.S. foreign policy under President Carter. He was particularly dissatisfied with the role which Carter assigned to Brzezinski in carrying out American policy. His final decision to resign, UPI reports, was announced by Vance following preparations for carrying out the military operation in Iran. According to the statements by American officials, referred to by UPI, Vance had decided to resign immediately after the conclusion of the operation, regardless of its outcome. The secretary of state had many times tried to dissuade Carter from carrying out such an operation and after Carter rejected his recommendations it was decided that the former could not stay in his post.

Druzhinin Report

LD281120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 28 Apr 80

[Text] Aleksandr Druzhinin, our correspondent in the United States of America, reports:

An event has taken place in Washington which has seriously rocked the political circles of the American capital. U.S. secretary of state, Cyrus Vance, has handed in his resignation. Attempts are now being made in circles close to the Carter administration to present matters as if Vance made plans to quit even before the latest events in Iran. However, no one among Washington political observers doubts that the reason for the resignation of the secretary of state was the U.S. military provocation against Iran, undertaken on direct orders from the President under the guise of freeing the American hostages.

It has become known from well-informed sources that Cyrus Vance was categorically opposed to the adventure. However, his arguments, it is reported, came up against a blank wall of silence.

Commenting today on Vance's departure from the State Department, the American papers see it as a slap in the face for the Washington administration.

And, true enough, it is hard not to concur that this step completely cuts the ground from under the feet of those who had asserted that the American military action in Iran allegedly had unanimous backing in U.S. political circles.

The resignation of the secretary of state shows clearly that such unanimity does not exist. It illustrates that Washington politicians capable of sobermindedness well understand where the dangerous course of military adventures can take the country.

However, the Carter administration evidently does not wish to heed these warning signals. Moreover, circles closely linked with the White House are striving to use the collapse of the so-called operation to rescue the hostages to foment chauvinist sentiments and military hysteria in the United States of America.

Today's U.S. press published a statement by Brzezinski, U.S. presidential adviser for national security affairs. He said outright that Washington does not intend to renounce armed action against Iran in the future. Official American propaganda continues to shower a torrent of threats against Iran and its leaders and openly calls for the use of armed force against the independent country. This unambiguous sabre-rattling shows that the United States of America intends to continue its collapsing policy with regard to Iran, which poses a threat not only to the security of the countries of the Near and Middle East, but also universal peace.

CONTINUING COMMENT, REACTION TO ABORTED HOSTAGE RESCUE MISSION

Carter TV Address

LD251713 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Washington, 25 April, TASS--U.S. President J. Carter made a statement early this morning which was carried by American television. He admitted that preparations for the diversionary operation undertaken by his administration in Iran were begun immediately after the seizure of the personnel of the American Embassy in Tehran. In other words, J. Carter admitted that while taking refuge in talk about adherence to "peaceful means" of resolving the American-Iranian crisis, the U.S. Government was preparing military actions against the Islamic Republic of Iran, awaiting only an opportune moment to carry them out.

J. Carter stated that on the eve of the armed raid he personally met and talked with its leaders. In other words, the "commando" diversionary group received all its instructions directly from the head of the White House.

J. Carter went on to repeat this version of events. According to this version, a subversive group, whose aim was to prepare for the reception of special forces whose mission was to carry out a raid on Tehran, was landed in a remote desert region of Iran. Technical trouble on board a helicopter, he declared, forced the commandoes to abandon the operation. He said that while this order was being carried out, two U.S. aircraft collided on the ground, resulting in eight persons dead and several injured.

J. Carter added that he would announce further information about the operation "at the appropriate time".

Local political observers regard this statement as evidence that the President is keeping quiet about something and obviously concealing important circumstances relating to what has happened.

J. Carter again hypocritically alleged that the subversive action of the United States, which dresses up in the garb of a friend of the Muslim peoples, was carried out "for the sake of lessening tension in the world". As is clear, the White House with unheard of cynicism, equated even armed adventures fraught with the danger of a serious confrontation in the Near East with peaceful intentions.

U.S. Reaction

LD251520 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Washington--the armed provocation by the Carter administration against the Islamic Republic of Iran has caused an outburst of indigation and resentment in the United States. Shock, horror, confusion--reports AP describing the reactions of Americans to this reckless act.

I simply dont' know what to say, was the reaction to the announcement of this piece of adventurism from Senator Weicker. All I can say is that it is very bad, stated Congressman Zablocki, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He continued: There are no justifications for the actions of the President. It was stupidity on his part not even to warn Congress about them.

Serious concern at the consequences of the adventurist actions of the administration was expressed by Senator Jackson, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It is perfectly obvious, he stated, that in the present conditions only time and patience can yield results and lead to the release of the hostages.

The announcement of the incident, said Congressman Anderson, one of the candidates for the U.S. presidency in the 1980 election, filled my heart with profound grief and sadness. The attempt by President Carter to earn cheap political capital by putting at risk the hostages' lives has caused anger and indignation among their near ones and dear ones.

He wanted to kill the hostages, said the mother of one of them, (Barry Rosen). It is awful. We were so hoping that it would all end without bloodshed, and now eight people have already died. Surely their lives are no less important than those of the hostages, said the wife of one of the Americans being detained in Tehran from San Diego, (Moorfield). A relative of another hostage, (Frafe), called the death of the eight American servicemen who took part in the attack being prepared on the embassy a futile sacrifice. What stupidity; it's such a blow, I just don't know what to think. I don't know what to say either. This was the reaction of the mother of Marine Sergeant Mcgill. The father of another hostage, (Gallagher), stressed that his only remaining hope was that Washington's adventurist sally would not bring the gravest consequences.

The attempt to land the American party in Iran, in the view of the Baltimore SUN, undoubtedly threatens to cause international complications.

Church Criticizes Decision

LD252018 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Washington, April 25, TASS--The armed provocation undertaken by the U.S. President against Iran caused sharp criticism in U.S. Congress. Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Frank Church accused President Carter of violating a 1973 law which states that the U.S. President has no right to begin a war or use U.S. troops abroad without prior consultations with Congress and a relevant decision by the legislative branch.

Frank Church said that the committee he is heading intends to carry out a complete investigation into President Carter's personal decision.

Press Reaction

LD272336 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1512 GMT 27 Apr 80

[Text] New York, 27 April, TASS--The American press, with reference to official persons, writes that the Carter administration has not been deterred from further attempts to find a military solution to the "problem of the hostages."

"An attempt to land a fresh force may be carried out in the autumn, in the opinion of experts, when favorable conditions for doing so are created. The transfer of the hostages to various regions of Iran means that the operation to rescue them will be on a much larger scale and must be preceded by long and careful intelligence operations," writes the informed military observer of the New York TIMES, D. Middleton.

In his opinion particular attention will be concentrated on such "alternative" measures as mining Iranian ports, a blockade of the Persian Gulf and bombing of Iran's oil refineries.

"Experts believe that mining the Iranian prots would yield the best results," Middleton continues. " Supporters of these operations claim that it would lead to an end of oil supplies from Iran which are the main source of its revenue."

"President Carter," writes New York TIMES observer J. Reston, "is now occupied with a second rescue operation. He is trying to save himself, but it won't be easy. In private conversations even his best friends are saying that this was a stupid operation."

Such intentions, not to mention their implementation, are nothing more than crude violation of international laws, an encroachment by "he who is strong" on the rights of another sovereign state, a desire to aggravate the situation to its fullest extent in one of the tensest regions of the world, and to threaten mankind with another world war.

Meanwhile the press here is exposing more and more details of Washington's disastrous adventurist undertaking in the Iranian desert.

The papers are already openly saying that this was an attempt at a coup in Iran by forces of U.S. secret agents and a "fifth column," set in motion by the CIA.

For example, the New York TIMES reports that back in November of last year specially trained commandos began being sent to Iran. By speaking Farsi they were able to pass themselves off as Iranians and engaged in gathering intelligence data. By January the commandos had succeeded in establishing themselves in Tehran and setting up communications with "dissident groups," in other words, with U.S. accomplices in the Iranian capital.

The New York POST writes that during the planned attack by the landing force on the American Embassy the commandos were due to arrange "disturbances or a riot" in Tehran which would divert attention from the main operation. The question arises, the paper writes, were the "rioters" not given a broader task?

The DAILY WORLD points to the presence in Washington of secret plans to overthrow the present Government of Iran, writing, in part, that "it is worth pondering over whether a riot, previously prepared and organized by the CIA against the Iranian Government, had been planned. A strike--possibly against the Ayatollah Khomeyni--by condemned prisoners, selected by the White House, dressed in Iranian uniform, could have provoked a civil war. The CIA had already worked this trick in 1953 during the overthrow of the Mosaddeq government and the return of the shah to the throne."

As has become evident from press reports, those who carried out the disastrous operation to release the hostages intended to use chemical weapons. It had been planned that the American saboteurs would use gas and other poisonous substances for the physical extermination of the Iranian students guarding the U.S. Embassy building in Teheran. The White House also placed high hopes on groups of CIA agents situated inside Iran.

Goncharov: Danger to Allies

LD251554 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 25 Apr 80

["An Incentive to the Adventures of Washington"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 25 April, TASS--TASS political observer, Vladimir Goncharov writes:

The reckless military adventure undertaken by Washington against Iran is a breach of all norms of international law which has confronted the world with a threat of creating a new hotbed of war, and has illuminated the substance of the present foreign political course of the United States. It showed the enormity of the danger represented by such a course of American imperialism for all countries of the world, including the allies and partners of the United States in the military-political blocs.

By using the levers of the notorious "Atlantic solidarity", the United States are forcing their partners not only to approve of their dangerous actions, but also to repeat and copy them. As the Luxembourg session of the EC Council has shown, the United States' allies in NATO follow the lead of the White House and support Washington's dangerous anti-Iranian course. They adopted a decision to cut diplomatic personnel of the EC countries in Tehran and of Iranian missions in West European capitals; they introduced limitations on the issue of visas to Iranian citizens; they refused to conclude new export agreements with Iran. Moreover, sacrificing their own interests, they threatened Iran with an embargo on the purchase of Iranian oil.

However, by all accounts, this was not enough for the White House. Literally not a day passes without Washington issuing a peremptory shout in the direction of the United States' West European partners. The day before yesterday it was Brzezinski in an interview given to the French newspaper LE FIGARO and the weekly PARIS-MATCH who demanded that the West European partners stop their "grumbling" and "criticism" of U.S. policy on Iran and be more actively supportive of this policy. Yesterday it was the U.S. President who bawled out the allies, demanding "stronger action" and "faster action" from them against Iran. Carter was followed the same day by a back-up speech from former Secretary of State Kissinger, who accused the West European countries of insufficient solidarity with Washington. Let us note that all these demands are being issued after the Luxembourg session when, as FRG Foreign Minister Genscher said, the Carter administration "should be satisfied with the decisions taken by the EC." But by all accounts Washington wants more from its allies. What exactly? Today a precise answer can by given to that question. The United States are now demanding approval and support for their new step on the path of escalating anti-Iranian action--approval and support for the American military adventure against Iran.

But who knows, perhaps even this will not be enough for Washington. It can by no means be excluded that, following "Atlantic logic" the White House will demand from its allies not only applause but also the sending of British, West German and other military assault troops to Iran...

It is significant that the official representatives of West European countries which are NATO members refuse to comment on the current military adventure of the United States. Well, maybe one can understand them. What can they say when in conformity with the practice which has taken shape in relations between the senior and the junior Atlantic partners Washington not only did consult its NATO allies but even deliberately hid from them the piratical scheme of the air attack on Iran. NATO headquarters in Brussels was forced to admit this.

However, the leaders of the West European countries cannot remain silent forever; they will have to define their position.

The near future will show whether they will continue to support Washington, encouraging it to carry out more reckless adventures which would be exceptionally dangerous for the cause of universal peace. One thing is clear; by approving and supporting such a course by the United States they are taking upon themselves an immense responsibility.

Repeat Action Possible

LD271650 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 27 Apr 80

[Text] Washington, April 27, TASS--President Jimmy Carter of the United States held an urgent conference in the White House at which his Assistant for National Security Affairs Zbigniew Brzezinski reported the "details" of the abortive operation to free the American hostages in Tehran, who are accused of spying against Iran.

At a press conference the White House spokesman Jody Powell refused to comment on reports that the hostages had been removed from the American Embassy to various parts of Iran. At the same time he intimated that the President had not given up the possibility of repeating a military operation against Iran, that is of taking reckless steps capable of resulting in the death of the American hostages. Powell said that the President's options remained the same as before the raid.

The Pentagon, the establishment that directly carried out Washington's criminal plans, has actively joined the campaign of whitewashing the administration's adventuristic actions. A high-placed representative of the Department of Defense has said that in the administration's opinion the raid had an acceptable chance of success.

He did not go into the details of Washington's abortive adventure and only stressed that it was planned in the course of the past four months. It follows from this that the Washington administration's hypocritical statements about its desire to solve the "Iranian crisis" by peaceful means were intended for public consumption and served simply as a screen for the secretly prepared military operation involving the landing of an American force in Iran. The Pentagon representative said that the removal of the hostages from the American Embassy would complicate but not rule out a further operation.

Bulantsev: 'Bandit Sally'

LD251730 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 25 Apr 80

["Who Are the Accomplices in the Act of Brigandages?"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, April 25, TASS--TASS news analyst Sergey Bulantsev writes:

The world public is literally flabbergasted at the news that the U.S. military, upon instructions for the White House, committed a bandit attack on a sovereign state--the Islamic Republic of Iran. Many press comments emphasize that this bandit sally grossly violates all the norms of international law. At the same time observers ask: Whence did that bandit action proceed from? It is supposed that Egypt provided its territory as a base for the attack. According to other reports the U.S. aircraft had taken off from Turkish air fields. Time will, of course, set the record straight as to where the bandit attack on Iran had originated. Already now, however, one is in a position to state definitely the following: No matter where the attack had originated, the country which had permitted the use of its territory for carrying out an action extremely hostile to Iran is an accomplice. Moreover, this act of international piracy has once again demonstrated how dangerous it is to allow the use of one's territory as a U.S. military base: The fact is that the responsibility for the dangerous adventures of the U.S. military lies on the governments of such countries.

Details of Plan; 'Top Secret' Force

LD262020 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Washington, 26 April, TASS--Details have become known of the preparation of the diversionary action by the United States against the Iranian Islamic Republic which was committed in violation of the norms of international law and which is an act of international banditry and brigandage.

Speaking at a press conference, H. Brown, chief of the Pentagon reported that this operation had been carried out during the night of 24-25 April. Eight helicopters of the U.S. Air Force and the military transport aircraft assigned to them, which had onboard 90 specially trained U.S. servicemen, left for a remote landing area in the Iranian desert 200 miles from Tehran which was intended to be used for refueling. "Depening on the success of this and other steps," Brown pointed out, "it was intended to take a decision later concerning the rescue operation itself."

However, as the Pentagon chief reported, during the flight to the landing place problems developed in two helicopters, one of which landed in the desert and whose crew was evacuated, and the other which reversed course and landed onboard the aircraft carrier Nimitz in the Arabian Sea. And, finally, upon arrival at the landing strip in the desert serious failure developed in the hydraulic system of one more helicopter.

Because of this the operation was canceled and during the preparation for the departure, "a collision took place between one of the helicopters and the C-130 in complete darkness." Both of them caught fire and, as has already been reported, 8 members of the crews lost their lives.

Answering questions, Brown was forced to admit that the U.S. "commandos," who were retiring from Iranian territory in haste and in cowardly fashion, abandoned the bodies of their dead comrades as well as four operational helicopters and departed onboard the remaining C-130 aircraft.

The Pentagon chief reported that the initial decision to plan and prepare this diversionary operation was taken as far back as November of last year, that is, precisely at the time when President H. Carter asserted that he excluded the use of military force in solving the conflict with Iran.

Additional details of the bandit operation against Iran were reported with references to sources in the military department by Washington POST observers J. Wilson and M. Hetler. According to them the diversionary group was to have been transferred in helicopters from the provisional landing strip in the desert to the environs of Tehran and from there to leave in cars for the U.S. Embassy. "Officials of the Pentagon and the White House let it be understood that the United States had accomplices in Tehran who helped determine the precise moment of the attack," they write.

At the planned moment the embassy was to be guarded "by minimum forces." The attackers were to "neutralize" the guards without effort, collect all the hostages and transfer them beyond the boundaries of Tehran by helicopter where six C-130 military transport aircraft were to be waiting with engines running.

The diversionary group and the hostages were to dive into the aircraft and be flown out of the country, leaving the helicopters behind. According to the authors' testimony, 3 landing strips on Iranian territory had been selected for the operation: one at a distance of 200 miles to the southwest of Tehran, for refueling the helicopters; one in the immediate vicinity of the town where the attackers were to wait for 1 day and from where the next night they were to carry out the raid on the embassy in transport earlier readied; and the third also near the capital from where the hostages were to be taken away.

In another article the Washington POST stresses that in order to carry out the diversionary plan the U.S. Government "had implemented a carefully worked out campaign to deceive not only Iran but also the entire world." In order to keep secret the operation being prepared and to make the maximum contribution to its success, "by its words and deeds the administration focused the world's attention on mid-May, hinting that only after this time would the prospect of some military actions against Iran become considerably stronger."

Within the framework of this campaign, J. Carter held a press conference on 12 April with West European journalists, which "was a key one in diverting attention from any decisive operations in April," and which was the day after the last preparations for the provocative diversion had been approved.

On 17 April the President announced a new series of sanctions against Iran. "Banning trips to Iran and the appeal to U.S. journalists to leave that country had been made first of all in connection with the approaching deadline of the operation," the paper quotes statements by U.S. officials. "The final effort to disguise the operation was undertaken 2 days before the start of the operation when H. Jordan, the President's assistant, called a conference of White House staff members on Iran after which the White House deliberately promoted the 'leak' to the press of information to the fact that a plan for an operation 'had been discussed but had been rejected.'" This information was published in the Los Angeles TIMES. And, finally, after the start of the operation the President kept to his normal daily schedule, just as all White House staff, "for the purposes of disguise."

The U.S. press also reports that the failed military provocation mounted by Washington against Iran was carried out by a special top-secret unit of the U.S. Armed Forces. In particular, according to AP, the group which is well known under the codenames "Delta Team" and "Blue Light," and which has had an intensive training course in subversive operations and in the use of chemical weapons, including toxic gases, took part in it. The precise numbers involved in the group, which has an unlimited budget and access to the most modern weapons, including chemical arms, is known only to a handful of top-rankers in the Pentagon. The unit is directly subordinate to the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. This report was confirmed by the New York DAILY NEWS, which says that the group of U.S. "commandoes" began "practicing details of the operation in the southwest of the country at the end of last year." "Judging from reports," the newspaper remarks, "this volunteer team was at Fort Bragg base in North Carolina and was called 'Delta Team.'"

The detachment, picked from special branches, practiced the operation at least 30 times, the CBS television network reports. "There is evidence," the television network stresses, "that it was proposed to use poison gas during the assault on the U.S. Embassy to temporarily incapacitate the guards."

Juding from press material, the J. Carter administration had already on one occasion prepared a similar diversionary act against Iran.

The LUMBERTON ROBESONIAN, a newspaper published in Fort Bragg, North Carolina, citing sources at the Fort Bragg military base, writes that 3 days after the students seized the U.S. Embassy building in Tehran, the J. Carter administration dispatched a "top-secret group" to the "environs of the Iranian capital: on an assignment which included "storming the embassy building and freeing the U.S. hostages."

However, the newspaper observes, the White House did not at that time take the decision to issue the order to initiate the operation and it recalled the group.

The LUMBERTON ROBESONIAN points out that the men in the first diversionary group were also selected from the "Blue Light" unit which is based at Fort Bragg. According to data the newspaper gives, this unit comprises 300 servicemen ranking no lower than sergeant and that when the group was being formed preference was given to volunteers "with a high IQ, good physical characteristics and an ability to keep their mouths shut." "Blue Light," it observes, trains in an area of Fort Bragg that is entirely closed to visitors, and its leader, Colonel C. Beckwith, has a direct link to the headquarters of the U.S. diversionary paratroopers well known as the "Green Berets."

Despite the failure of the provocative sally against the Islamic Republic of Iran, the United States, by all accounts, is not renouncing plans to use military forces to solve the U.S.-Iranian conflict. As the ABC television network points out, U.S. President J. Carter may, in the opinionof observers, try to activate the aborted plan again. For its part, the New York TIMES stresses that "according to administration views, direct military operations against Iran remain on the agenda."

Vasilyev: 'Recklessness Must End'

LD281107 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 80 p 5

[Gennadiy Vasilyev "Observer's Opinion"]

[Text] Washington's dangerous military-political adventure has ended in a shameful fiasco. Prattle about the "humane aims" of the armed U.S. incursion onto a sovereign country's territory and prattle to the effect that this military diversion was even designed to "reduce international tension" is to be heard from the banks of the Potomac.

The thuggish style of the operation's organizers has reminded many observes of another instance of international gangsterism--the 1976 raid on Entebbe Airport in Uganda by Tel Aviv cutthroats. Recent reports of CIA consultations with the Israeli secret service Mossad, and West Germany's BND are being interpreted in a new light in this connection.

But it is clear that the exchange of experience was no help. The subversive adventure sanctioned by the U.S. administration failed.

The events played out in the skies and on the soil of Iran are evidence that reasonable, sober principles are being manifested less and less in the Carter administration. On the contrary, an inclination for impulsive, reckless actions is increasingly prevailing. The practical moves made by the Washington champions of "humanity" and "human rights" imply a serious threat to the peace and welfare of the peoples of the vast Near and Middle East region and jeopardize the lives of the Americans who may not be dragged into adventures.

Mr Carter has repeatedly said that he is acutely anxious to free, safe and unharmed, the American Embassy officials being held in Tehran. But what is Washington actually doing?--launching military provocations, threats and political and economic blackmail. All this is not only failing to bring the day of the hostages' release any nearer but is merely complicating the problem. Meanwhile the Iranian leaders have repeatedly stressed that the problem could have been settled long ago had the United States really wanted this. After all, Iran would still like to secure a U.S. commitment not to interfere in Iran's internal affairs, which is a perfectly natural desire in the light of past decades, when the CIA behaved in that country as though it were at home, deposing leaders elected by the Iranian people and establishing a bloody regime convenient to Washington. But the American administration stubbornly refuses to assume such a commitment. The White House declares that it would be a humiliation for the United States. Yet what the Iranians are demanding as a condition for releasing the hostages is merely recognition of elementary norms of international law.

Just where is the course of military provocations and of stepping up international tension pursued by the United States in the Near and Middle East leading: Many people, in West Europe included, are now asking themselves that question with mounting concern. An EEC foreign minister's conference had only just decided, under strong pressure from Washington, on economic and diplomatic "sanctions" against Iran. Certain conference participants justified the need for this decision by claiming that a show of "Atlantic solidarity" would help to keep the United States from dangerous military moves.

The adventure of the U.S. landing in Iran has shown the invalidity of those expectations. Carter not only made this dangerous move but did so, as he himself admitted, etirely on his own responsibility.

"Complaisance" by the West European allies leads, therefore, to completely the opposite results. The policy of "appeasement" is making the American President still more impulsive, adventurist and unpredictable. This policy threatens to drag the West European countries, irrespective of their wishes and in defiance of their national interests, into a dangerous conflict in the Near and Middle East.

The Carter administration is playing an irresponsible game. The recklessness must be ended.

Orlov Comment

LD261129 Moscow TASS in English 0851 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Moscow, April 26, TASS--TASS political news analyst Igor Orlov writes:

The more obvious becomes the dangerous character of the consequences of the Washington-imposed NATO's decision on deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in a number of West European states, the higher is the wave of protest against the American diktat. Hardly a day passes by without TASS receiving news on mass meetings and demonstrations held in Western Europe. The participants in those demonstrations and meetings demand again and again to stop the hand of the Pentagon and NATO militarists who raised a nuclear missile sword over the destinies of detente in Europe and outside it.

There is no doubt that at least some political and military leaders in the West are ready for the sake of 'saving Europe' to destroy it, writes well-known American scientist Herbert York.

Seeking to prevent the public from knowing the genuine meaning of their hegemonistic plans, the Washington strategists put into play the whole arsenal of propaganda-subversive means: False arguments about imaginary "Soviet superiority", fables about the non-existent "Soviet threat" and fabrications about the so-called "impotence" of NATO. In reality, the matter is not in mythical nuclear superiority of the Soviet Union in Europe. The matter is that exactly Washington seeks such superiority in a stubborn way, resorting to all means, in a bid to upset in its favour the approximate parity, the equilibrium of forces now existing in Europe. Exactly this aim is pursued by the deployment in Western Europe of American medium-range nuclear missiles directed against the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty member-states.

Having taken the course of aggravating the international situation, at reviving in Europe, and not only in Europe the imperialist "big club" policy, the United States seeks to subjugate West European states, to compel its junior NATO partners to implicitly follow the American foreign policy line.

Another proof of recklessness of the present foreign policy course of Washington is the abortive venture to land American commandos on the territory of a sovereign state--Iran. That venture will impel the public of West European countries to have still greater doubts in correctness of behaviour of those West-European leaders who display the amazing readiness to bow to the White House's directives.

Such a course is contrary to the fundamental national interests of the peoples of West European countries which by no means want to become hostages of the Pentagon generals. Hence, the growing movement of protest against the perfidious plans of the overseas strategists.

"In Europe, Leonid Brezhnev stresses, many constructive things could be done in favour of peace in a not remote future specifically in connection with the coming meeting in Madrid and the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty countries that a conference on military detente and disarmament be held". From this exactly proceeds the Soviet Union which actively advocates continuation of the negotiations that began in the recent years in order to end the arms race, to lessen the military confrontation in Europe. The strength of universal peace, the security of every country separately is ensured not by escalation of armaments, not by deployment of missiles, which is stubbornly sought by the United States and NATO but by the search for ways of military detente, the search for steps aimed at establishing trust, at curbing the ruinous and extremely dangerous arms race.

Gerasichev: Public's Reaction

LD261550 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Our New York correspondent Vladimir Gerasichev reports on the reaction of the American public to the U.S. administration's new anti-Iranian adventure:

The latest White House adventure, an attempt by force to free the American hostages in Tehran, has ended in total failure. Eight killed, dozens wounded and seven helicopters and one giant transport plane destroyed are the cost of this adventure, the true scale of which is being carefully concealed by Washington.

According to the account given journalists by Defense Secretary Brown 90 specially-trained commandos, or more simply diversionaries, flew under cover of night on eight helicopters from the aircraft-carrier Nimitz, which is situated in the Persian Gulf, and moved in the direction of Tehran. During the flight, if one believes the words of the secretary, three helicopters went out of service one after the other through mechanical difficulties and then another helicopter blew up together with a giant C-130 transport aircraft, one of the six aircraft flown to Iran the same night from Egypt to transport the hostages rescued by the diversionaries. However, things did not get that far. The operation had to be postponed and the diversionaries had to get quickly off Iranian soil in the remaining aircraft.

Many people here today are attempting to answer the question whether this was really an attempt to free the hostages or was it the beginning of a planned extensive military incursion by American troops into Iran. After all dozens of warships, hundreds of combat aircraft and thousands of marines have been aimed against Iran in recent months. Iran has become literally encircled by American naval and air force bases. The most reactionary Near East regimes, Oman, Israel and Egypt, have been vying with each other in offering the Americans their territory as a springboard for attacking Iran.

A fully justified question is: Why did Washington need this military adventure? There are several reasons: An attempt to stifle the Iranian revolution, a display of military strength to the countries of the Near East and an attempt by extreme measures to improve Carter's position in his battle against contenders for the presidency. As the White House has stated, the decision to carry out the operation was taken by the President on 11 April, that is at a time when Carter and his aides were feeling particularly acutely the possibility of a victory by Senator Kennedy at the primaries in the major industrial state of Pennsylvania. All or nothing is probably what the master of the White House thought and, as it is being claimed in Washington, he has nevertheless probably ended up with nothing.

When Congressman Henry Reuss learned of the failure of the latest White House adventure, he said: President Carter should now announce that he is no longer a candidate for reelection and quietly finish out his term without any more impulsive actions. A number of congressmen have demanded of the White House an explanation as to why President Carter took the decision to use military force without prior consultations with Congress in accordance with existing legislation and with NATO allies, whom, incidentally, Washington had assured just beforehand that it did not intend to employ military force to free the hostages and which in response to these assurances gave in to the White House administration's pressure and announced economic and diplomatic sanctions against Iran.

Frank Church, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has stated that his committee will make a full inquiry into the facts connected with the President's decision to carry out the operation in Iran.

Attempt to Carry Off Iranians

LD261324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] During the abortive piratical action in Iran the U.S. saboteurs used violence toward peaceful Iranian inhabitants, whom they tried to carry off to the United States. As PARS has reported, the American fighters stopped a passenger bus near the town of Tabas and subjected its passengers to beating and humiliation. The landing force tried to drag people into an aircraft by force in order to carry them to the United States. However, after another U.S. aircraft caught fire the Americans hastily withdrew.

Attempts to Conceal Facts

LD281046 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 28 Apr 80

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Yevgeniy Kachanov]

[Summary] The first batch of U.S. hostages has been taken from Tehran to Tabriz. Another batch is in Qom, while some remain in the capital.

"Another report says that the bodies of the U.S. saboteurs who died in the desert disaster have been brought to Tehran and placed in the U.S. Embassy building. The snag is that Washington officially insists that eight men died in the desert, whereas nine bodies have been brought to Tehran. Even this, according to UPI, is not a final figure. The Iranian military authorities say that the number of Americans killed is considerably greater. Moreover, several foreigners have been detained near Kerman. It is thought that there are among them disguised American saboteurs. Thus it is perfectly obvious that the American administration is clumsily trying to conceal from the public the true scale of its latest failure. It is not for nothing that the world press has already ironically christened the failed attempt to free the hostages 'operation fiasco'."

NAVAL PRESENCE OFF IRAN BEING BUILT UP

LD280356 Moscow TASS in English 0820 GMT 28 Apr 80

[Text] Washington, April 28, TASS--The United States is building up its military presence off the coast of Iran. The UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL reported that the Constellation aircraft carrier escorted by six warships and the Eisenhower aircraft carrier accompanied by South Carolina and Virginia guided missile cruisers have entered the Indian Ocean. The U.S. President has ordered them to join the U.S. naval armada concentrated near the Iranian coast. The CBS television announcer said that the number of U.S. warships in that area had reached 34.

WESTERN ECONOMIC COOPERATION LEADS TO IMPERIALISTIC RELIANCE

LD250805 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15 Signed to Press 7 Apr 80 p 22

[V. Sidorov article: "China: Contrary to the People's Interests"]

[Text] Disproportions and contradictions arising from the Maoists' voluntarist experiments continue to burden China's economy. As even China's present leaders admit, the country's economy was on the "verge of catastrophe" several times during the seventies. In order to extricate the country from a critical situation, in 1978 Beijing adopted the ambitious four modernizations program aimed at turning China by the end of the century into a mighty power with a large military potential. But the failure to back this program with internal material and financial resources and the clear disparity between optimistic wishes and reality obliged China's leaders to modify the four modernizations program in 1979 by means of the so-called "policy of readjustment" to cover 1979-1981. It has been even more clearly revealed that the 10-year plan for the development of the PRC national economy in 1976-1985 has been a failure and, as was confirmed by the last CCP Central Committee plenum, the Beijing leaders are loath to discuss the real causes of that failure.

At the same time the Chinese leadership plans to link the paths of the country's development closely with active expansion of economic ties with the capitalist states, chiefly with the United States, intensifying ties with them to the extent of creating the most favorable conditions for foreign capital to operate in the Chinese economy.

Orientation on Capitalist Countries

This is also demonstrated by China's foreign trade figures for 1978-1979. According to Chinese press reports, they may be summarized as follows:

	(in billions of yuan) 1978	1979
Total trade (in U.S. dollars PRC Trade in 1979 totaled $30 billion)	35.1	45.3
Exports	16.7	21.2
Imports	18.4	24.1
Balance	minus 1.7	minus 2.9

One is struck by the sharp increase in the PRC's foreign trade deficit. In 1979 alone it increased by 70 percent and stood at 2.9 billion yuan. This was caused by a further increase in Chinese imports from the industrially developed capitalist countries. As a result the capitalist countries' share of China's foreign trade continues to grow and the socialist countries' share continues to decrease. Thus, according to provisional estimates, in 1977-1979 the capitalist countries' increased from 83 to 88 percent, while the socialist countries' share decreased from 17 to 12 percent.

In the last 2 years China has been actively soliciting Western state and private credits and has begun not only creating mixed enterprises and concluding barter agreements but also exporting manpower. The policy of rapprochement with the imperialist states' most reactionary circles which Beijing is pursuing runs counter to the Chinese people's vital interests. It will inevitably lead to an increase in China's dependence on international imperialism--the Chinese people's archenemy.

China's treacherous attack on the Socialist Republic of Vietnam sharply exacerbated the political situation and led to a severance of economic ties with Vietnam. The people's governments of Laos and Kampuchea were not to Beijing's liking, which also led to the severance of foreign ties with these countries, firmly embarked on the path of socialist development. By pursuing such a policy toward socialist countries, Beijing is trying to use foreign economic levers for its own mercenary political purpose.

Despite the fact that the CEMA member countries have great scientific, technical and industrial potential and have sufficient potential for international cooperation, on a variety of pretexts Beijing is holding back the expansion of economic ties with a number of CEMA countries.

China's trade with individual socialist countries in 1978 may be summarized as follows: R540 million with Romania, R339 million with the Soviet Union, R202 million with the GDR, and R179 million with Czechoslovakia.

Last year, 1979, Beijing stepped up its policy of flirting with the imperialist states' reactionary circles. In the hope of getting modern equipment and technology, especially weapons, from them it concluded trade agreements with Japan, the United States, the Common Market and Sweden, and agreements on industrial, scientific and technical cooperation with the FRG, France, Britain, Italy and other countries.

According to provisional figures, compared with 1978 trade between China and the industrially developed capitalist countries increased in 1979 by 40 percent to reach $17 billion. Trade between China and its main trading partner Japan totaled $6.6 billion, an increase of 32 percent in the year; the United States--$2.3 billion (double); the FRG--$2 billion (a 47-percent increase); France and Australia--$0.8 billion each; and Canada and Britain--$0.7 billion each.

China's trade deficit with the industrially developed capitalist countries has reached almost $6 billion (compared with $4.5 billion in 1978). China's foreign trade debt to the United States now stands at more than $1 billion, to the FRG--$0.9 billion, to Japan--$0.8 billion, and to Canada and Australia--$0.5 billion each.

The industrially developed capitalist countries buy fuel, raw materials, consumer goods and food and gustatory products from China. China, on the other hand, imports from Western countries machinery, equipment and transport facilities (approximately $3.5-4 billions' worth in 1979), rolled ferrous metals and pipes (more than 6 million tons), grain (11-12 million tons) and other goods.

Despite the considerable volume of Chinese-Japanese business ties, they are characterized not only by chronic imbalance but also by unreliability. As is well known, even before 1979 Japanese businessmen, after falling for Beijing's promises, concluded big deals with Chinese organizations. But these deals were "frozen" by Beijing at the beginning of 1979 because it did not have sufficient currency reserves. Beijing's insolvency disillusioned even the pro-Chinese lobby in Japan. True, after adopting the "policy of readjustments" China confirmed, albeit in a reduced form, its contracts for Japan to build a number of installations in China, including the first stage of the Baoshan metallurgical combine and several other combines.

Relying on Monopoly Capital

Beijing's aggressive anti-Soviet foreign policy course went down well with the present U.S. administration and military-industrial complex and stimulated a further expansion of U.S.-Chinese contracts. A trade agreement was signed in June 1979 between the PRC and the United States and ratified on 24 January 1980 which provided for the granting of most-favored-nation status to China. Last year U.S. exports to China were treble its imports from the country.

Compared with 1978 trade between the PRC and the EEC countries increased by almost 50 percent, while China's trade deficit with this group of imperialist states increased by 150 percent, reaching $1.5 billion.

Beijing's main creditors are the governments and private firms of Japan (around $10 billion), France ($6.5 billion), West Germany ($1.7 billion), Britain ($5.6 billion), and the United States ($2 billion). In addition, the French newspaper LES ECHOS has reported that Beijing has begun talks on obtaining credit from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development totalling $15 billion. By drawing China into the sphere of Western currency and financial relations, Beijing is increasing the Chinese economy's dependence on the world capitalist economy.

The "law on mixed companies based on Chinese and foreign capital" adopted in the PRC in 1979 opens up broad opportunities for foreign capital to penetrate the Chinese economy and for the exploitation of Chinese working people. It guarantees broad rights and privileges to foreign firms in China. Judging from statements made by Chinese officials, the proportion of foreign capital in mixed enterprises must be not less than 25 percent and can be as much as 100 percent. Moreover, the representatives of foreign firms are given the right to hold leading positions in the management of mixed enterprises and investors are given the right to freely transfer profits to foreign banks. Not even the world's economically least developed countries now make such concessions to foreign capital. To all appearances, the Beijing leaders are not worried about what serious socioeconomic repercussions could result from the penetration of monopoly capital into the country's economy.

As for the Chinese leaders' willingness to export manpower, they plan initially to allow around 1 million Chinese to travel abroad under contract to foreign firms and to get $2.5 billion a year for this. It has already been reported that an agreement has been signed between a Chinese construction and engineering company and the Italian state construction firm Italas, under which 15,000 Chinese workers will be sent to installations built by it. Under the terms of the agreement the Italian company will provide the equipment, technicians and skilled workers while the Chinese side will provide unskilled labor. Agreements have been concluded with other firms.

The progressive foreign press points out that Beijing's willingness to sell manpower on the capitalist market graphically demonstrates the Chinese leaders' disregard to the international proletariat's interests, since the export exacerbates the problem of unemployment in the capitalist world and is already being used by the bourgeoisie as an "antidote" to the intensification of the working people's struggle for their rights.

Carried Away by Militarism

Beijing's appetite for sophisticated military equipment and weapons, as well as the equipment and technology needed to produce them, continues to grow. China's potential requirement for combat hardware in order to reequip its army was calculated by U.S. experts who visited China with U.S. Secretary of Defense H. Brown as being worth as much as $60 billion. Representatives of the West's military-industrial complex with a vested interest in the sale of weapons to China and in reequipping its army succeeded in securing the adoption at the Assembly of the West European Union (June 1979) of documents providing for the possibility of supplying China with so-called "defensive" weapons. While the United States has hypocritically "banned" the sale of the latest equipment which could be used by China for military purposes, a station for receiving information from the U.S. Landsat D satellite, which could be used for military purposes, has in fact already been sold to China with the Carter administration's blessing. China is holding talks on purchasing U.S. transport, antisubmarine and other types of aircraft. Paying for the military orders entails spending vast amounts in national resources, which is one of the main causes of the slow development of the civilian sectors of the PRC economy and of the Chinese working people's low living standards.

By drawing China into the arms race the imperialist powers' military circles seek to exacerbate the international situation and to use it in the struggle against the socialist countries and the national liberation movement, that is, against the Chinese people's true allies.

JAPAN 'HOSTAGE OF WASHINGTON'S ADVENTURISTIC POLICY'

LD061002 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Moscow, April 25, TASS--TASS commentator Nikolay Viktorov writes:

On the eve of the visit to Washington by the Japanese Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira Tokyo decided to demonstrate "solidarity" with the aggressive policy of the United States in respect of Iran.

At a meeting on Thursday the Japanese Government decided to put a ban on the conclusion of contracts for the export of Japanese commodities to Iran, to restrict the entry of Iranian citizens into Japan and to recall from the country a part of the Japanese Embassy personnel.

The Carter administration, which is doing everything in its selfish interests to aggravate the international situation to the utmost, is satisfied. Following Common Market countries Japan is now joining Washington's anti-Iranian plot. But Japan has no reasons to rejoice at this step which is going to bring serious damage to its national interests.

Tokyo is well aware that participation in the anti-Iranian campaign might have an extremely negative impact on the Japanese economy, which, as different from the American one, depends in many ways on foreign trade and especially on deliveries of Iranian oil. For Japan imports almost 30 million tons of oil annually from Iran which has been its traditional trade partner for many years. As to the United States, it does not assume any obligations to make up for the loss of this important energy source. Washington persistently demands of its junior partner all possible restrictions on the export to the United States of its commodities while at the same time does not intend to increase its purchases of Japanese goods.

The stand taken by the Japanese authorities in the American-Iranian conflict really shows once again that Japan has found itself in the position of a hostage of Washington's adventuristic policy as a result of the conclusion of the bilateral military and political alliance. In fact, Japan has no possibility of pursuing an independent foreign policy course and adopting independent decisions. Ever more often it has to follow in the wake of Washington's aggressive geopolitical policy and push its own national interests to the background.

IMPORTANCE OF COOPERATION IN MONGOLIAN AGRICULTURE REVIEWED

LD251047 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 April 1980 Morning Editon publishes on page 5, under the headline "At an Accelerated Pace; Fraternal Soviet-Mongolian Cooperation--Proletarian Internationalism in Action," a 1,500-word Ulaan Baatar-datelined article by D. Maydar, member of the MPRP Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the Mongolian Council of Ministers, discussing the importance of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation in Mongolia's industrial and agricultural development.

ZIMYANIN-LED DELEGATION ARRIVES IN KABUL

LD261410 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Kabul, April 26, TASS--A Soviet party-and-government delegation led by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Mikhail Zimyanin came to the Afghan capital today to attend the celebrations of the second anniversary of the Afghan revolution. Among the delegation is Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Ivan Arkhipov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tadzhikistan Dzhabar Rasulov.

At the Kabul International Airport the delegation was welcomed by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, member of the Secretariat of the party Central Committee and member of the Presidium of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Nur Ahmad Nur, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Deputy Chairman of the Revolutionary Council, Deputy Prime Minister of the DRA Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the PDPA, Minister of Education of the DRA, Chairman of the Afghan-Soviet friendship society Anahita Ratebzad, member of the Central Committee of the PDPA, Minister of information and Culture of the DRA 'Abdol Majid Sarboland. Among the meeting party were the USSR ambassador to the DRA F.A. Tabeyev, who is a member of the party-and-government delegation, and other officials.

Meeting With Karmal

LD261104 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Kabul, April 26, TASS--A Soviet party-and-government delegation, led by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Mikhail Zimyanin, who arrived in the Afghan capital to attend the celebrations of the second anniversary of the Afghan revolution, was received today by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babark Karmal.

A friendly talk was held, which passed in a cordial atmosphere.

REPORTAGE ON SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF AFGHAN REVOLUTION

Karmal Address

LD261850 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1504 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Kabul, 26 April, TASS--A festive session devoted to the second anniversary of the Afghan revolution took place here today. It was attended by members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA], members of the PDPA Central Committee, of the Revolutionary Council and of the government, as well as representatives of the public and members of the diplomatic corps. Delegations of friendly countries took part in the festive session, including a Soviet party and government delegation led by M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

A major speech was delivered by Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, chairman of the Revolutionary Council and prime minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA].

Exactly 2 years ago, he said, the freedom-loving and noble people of Afghanistan opened a new page in their history. Under the leadership of their political vanguard--the PDPA--the progressive revolutionary forces of our homeland overthrew the power of the exploiters and opened up for Afghanistan a path of development from backwardness to progress and the formation on our ancient land of a new and just society. We realize that we are only at the very beginning of this path and we know that attaining the set goals will demand time and work. But the main thing has been accomplished: We have irrevocably embarked upon this path and are firmly convinced that we will create a new, flourishing and happy Afghanistan.

The April revolution was a response to the pressing and severe needs of the internal development of our country. However, for its victory certain external conditions were also necessary. The basic condition of this sort was the correlation of forces in the world, in which imperialism was not able to suppress the revolution by means of armed intervention or economic blockade.

In accepting with appreciation the internationalist aid of our great neighbor and brother--the Soviet Union--and other socialist countries and all revolutionary parties, movements and forces, we see our duty as being to expand, strengthen and protect the gains of the April revolution in order thereby to make our contribution to the common cause of all freedom-loving peoples.

We proceed from that truth, the rapporteur continued, that the improvement of the situation in the world and the region corresponds to the vital interests of the peoples of Afghanistan and constitutes an essential condition for accomplishing the tasks of the April revolution. Our sincere interest in stable peace is embodied in our active and persistent foreign policy activity. We are convinced that the preservation of peace also corresponds to the vital interests of all our neighboring states and all members of the world community.

Babrak Karmal stressed that the principles of peaceful coexistence, nonalignment and international solidarity constitute the foundations of the DRA's foreign policy.

Reaffirming its adherence to the principles of the nonaligned movement, he said, our party and government resolutely reject any attempts to exploit the measures taken by Afghanistan and the Soviet Union in the sphere of their bilateral relations and within the framework of treaty-based cooperation to undermine the DRA's position within the nonaligned movement and to place Afghanistan in opposition to its other members. The temporary presence on Afghan territory of a limited contingent of Soviet troops, who were brought in at the request of the legal Afghan Government, pursues just one aim: to assist Afghanistan in its defense against aggression. As soon as the attempts of the enemies of our motherland to interfere from outside in our internal affairs cease and the threat of foreign intervention is eliminated, the Soviet military contingent will be withdrawn under the corresponding arrangements between the DRA and the USSR.

In their foreign policy activities the PDPA and the DRA Government proceed on the basis that the happiness and prosperity of our people can be guaranteed on the condition of further strengthening and developing fraternal friendship and fruitful cooperation with the great Soviet Union. This friendship and cooperation are the cornerstone of the entire policy of new Afghanistan and are a vitally important factor in the defense of our beloved motherland and the reforms carried out by the April revolution.

The PDPA and DRA Government, the speaker continued, believe that the Middle East, Central, South and Southeast Asia, as well as the entire Indian Ocean zone, must not become a hotbed of war, a source of military menace for the peoples of the region and mankind in general. At present, the PDPA Central Committee and DRA Government have worked out a whole series of positive new initiatives aimed at an improvement in the international situation in the region and the creation of an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust, which is so necessary for the settlement of existing differences on the basis of calm, constructive and business-like talks.

These initiatives were published recently in the "Theses of the PDPA Central Committee for the Second Anniversary of the April Revolution," and it is our hope that they will meet with a positive response. We proceed from the belief that Afghanistan has no contradictions with neighboring states which cannot be settled by peaceful means, on the basis of good will and statesmanlike wisdom, and in the interests of peoples. And conversely, an escalation of unfriendly acts and mutual recriminations, let alone attempts at interference in internal affairs, can only bring grave consequences.

Speaking about the difficulties that the April revolution, which by its nature is a national-democratic revolution, has come up against, Babrak Karmal said that these difficulties in particular have been caused by the fact that in Afghanistan there was not a large, experienced working class tempered in class battles, over 90 percent of the population were unable to read and write, there was not the necessary number of managers and specialists at all levels who could combine devotion to the revolution with sufficient vocational and theoretical training, and the DRA lacked sufficiently firm traditions of collective leadership and democratic centralism which are vital to it in the new post-revolutionary conditions. Great damage to the revolution, he said, was done by the criminal actions of H. Amin, who was able by intrigues and deception to make his way to power. He ignored the traditions of the industrious Afghan people, practiced intolerable methods in carrying out the most important transformations and permitted gross violations of revolutionary legality.

The exploiters and traitors divested of power by the April revolution created serious difficulties for its cause. Replying on the broad help of imperialism, the Beijing hegemonists and reactionary circles of a number of foreign countries, soon after the revolution they started organizing sabotage terrorist groups, carrying out acts of sabotage and subversion and murdering and intimidating peaceful inhabitants. With the support and aid of their foreign patrons they also unleashed a broad campaign of disinformation and calumny directed against the April revolution and the PDPA. Many illiterate, oppressed and politically inexperienced people fell victim to this disinformation.

However, in the final analysis their criminal plans to undermine, distort and suppress the April revolution ended in failure. The patriotically healthy majority of members of the PDPA, the Revolutionary Council and the armed forces, relying on the unswerving resolve of the peoples of Afghanistan to save and defend their revolution, torpedoed the criminal designs of the enemies of the revolution. On 27 December 1979 the criminal regime of Amin was removed and a new, second stage of the revolution began.

The just cause of the April revolution is invincible. The support of the working people of Afghanistan and all the patriotic forces of the country for the PDPA's policy and programs for building a new life are a guarantee of this. The devotion of the republic's armed forces to the aims of the revolution and their readiness to defend its gains are a guarantee of this. The support and all-round help of the progressive forces of the entire world and, above all, the mighty Soviet Union are also a guarantee of this.

The speaker went on to talk about the economic activities of the DRA Government. He stressed that in spite of the heavy legacy of the past, Afghanistan is achieving considerable successes in the development of its economy. Production in electric power, gas condensate and nitrogenous fertilizers increased last year. The country obtained more woollen cloth, dressed leather, vegetable oil and many types of agricultural produce. The PDPA and the DRA see the path to resolving the economic tasks in the new stage of the revolution in the planned, dynamic development of the state, mixed, cooperative and private sectors of the national economy, with each complementing one another.

The share of the state sector in the overall industrial production on the DRA has already exceeded 40 percent.

Of particular significance for the country's economy are Afghan-Soviet cooperation projects which produce the main portion of the gross output of the state sector. The experience of more than 60 years of Soviet-Afghan cooperation makes it possible to draw a firm conclusion: The mutually advantageous cooperation of the DRA with the USSR is major factor in the economic progress of our country. The PDPA and the DRA Government pay constant attention to the development of agricultural production. In their concern for the welfare of the peasants and for increased agricultural production, the PDPA and the DRA Government have increased the purchase prices for raw cotton and sugarbeets by 20 to 30 percent. Prices for chemical fertilizer and agricultural equipment have been reduced. In the current year already machine-tractor stations will begin operating which will work the peasants' land for moderate remuneration.

Babrak Karmal stated that the PDPA and the DRA Government will continue to exert persistent efforts to strengthen the fraternal friendship and unity of all the large and small peoples of Afghanistan and to ensure their equality. The PDRA Central Committee, the Revolutionary Council and the DRA Government intend to continue to pursue in relation to the Pushtun tribes a policy of trust, peace and cooperation, to assist the strengthening of these tribes' democratic traditions and to help the steady raising of their well-being and the improvement of their living and working conditions. The PDPA and the DRA Government again call on the Pushtuns from the tribal zone and also all compatriots who emigrated abroad to return to their homeland and engage in peaceful labor, and [PDPA and DRA Government] solemnly give assurance that not one of those who return will be subjected to any punishment or persecution for actions which they were obliged to carry out while they were emigres.

On behalf of the PDPA Central Committee, the Revolutionary Council and the DRA Government, Babrak Karmal said that all the necessary conditions, full freedom and dependable safeguards for conducting all religious ceremonies are now and in the future guaranteed and secured for all Muslims of Afghanistan.

Celebrating the second anniversary of the April revolution, Babrak Karmal continued, we can say with full justification that all the political, economic and social transformations which have taken place during this time, as well as the April revolution itself, are inseparably linked with the leading and organizing role of the PDPA. Being a party of a new type and a vanguard of the working classes and all working people of our great country, the PDPA has from the very first days of its existence proclaimed in its program the need for radical transformation of the political basis of society, for the implementation of general democratic and national hopes of the popular masses while fully and strictly observing the traditions of our people. The party sees its final aim in building a new, just society where there will be no room for exploitation of man by man.

The speaker stressed that despite all the damage caused to the party and for all the treacherous plans to split and weaken its ranks, the PDPA has been tempered in the fire of grievous trials. Now, at the second stage of the April revolution, all the necessary conditions have been created for the full restoration of an atmosphere of trust and amicable revolutionary work in the party and for the definitive attainment and consolidation of the organizational and ideological unity of the PDPA. Genuine unity is manifested not in words and declarations, but joint actions, it is determined by participation in the practical struggle for common goals and ideals. Of great importance for combining the forces of all party organizations, of all members and candidate members of the party, are the decisions of the recently held plenum of the PDPA Central Committee and its confirmation of the party statues. The recently adopted decisions of the Politburo and Secretariat of the PDPA Central Committee laid the foundations for purposive and systematic mass political work among the different sections of the population.

We must work towards a situation in which the party's true and living word and the elucidation of its policy and the measures and decisions of the PDPA and Revolutionary Council are always brought home to the masses. In this cause, verbal agitation and propaganda and the mass news media have truly inexhaustible possibilities.

One of the most important achievements of the second stage of the April revolution was the Revolutionary Council's adoption of the historic "basic principles of the DRA." They proclaim and legally enshrine the fundamental and most important principles of the sociopolitical and economic setup, the legal status of citizens and the state structure of the DRA. The basic principles of the DRA enshrine the guiding role of the PDPA--the vanguard of the working class and all working people--with the activity of which all revolutionary changes in our country are inseparably linked, and they also establish the legal basis for the formation of the fatherland front. The political foundation of the front must be the close alliance and unity of the working class, peasantry and progressive intelligentsia. The political leader of the front will be the vanguard of the working class and all working people--the PDPA.

The greatness and scale of the tasks which face us, said Babrak Karmal in conclusion, are an inspiration, and they fill us with a sentiment of historical optimism. This historical optimism injects us with fresh strength, leads us to fresh achievements and exploits, and helps us to see our bright future beyond the cares, concerns and problems of the present.

The festive session was addressed by M.V. Zimyanin, the head of the Soviet party and government delegation.

Zimyanin Address

LD262030 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] [No dateline]--Entrusted by the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government, on behalf of all the Soviet people M.V. Zimyanin conveyed to the participants of the festive session and through them to all the members and activists of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA], to the working people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA] and all the Afghan people warm greetings in connection with the second anniversary of the glorious April revolution and wishes of peace and successes in the construction of the new life.

We are particularly pleased, he said, to fulfill a personal wish of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to convey to you his cordial greetings and wishes of prosperity and happiness to the people of Afghanistan.

The whole world knows, M.V. Zimyanin continued, that the April revolution was a turning point in the history of Afghanistan. It drew a line to centuries of feudal oppression and injustice against the popular masses and paved the way for democratic development and social progress in the country. The victory of the popular democratic revolution in Afghanistan is one of the lucid pages in the history of the world anti-imperialist struggle, whose beginnings were experienced by Lenin.

Even the first decrees of the new government which was formed by the PDPA led by Nur Mohammad Taraki, demonstrated that genuinely popular power, consistently putting through profound socioeconomic reforms, had been established inside the country.

However, the development of the revolutionary process in Afghanistan met with fierce resistance from international imperialism and the forces of reaction, which took the road of armed struggle against the democratic regime. Internal and external counterrevolution linked up the United States, China and the reactionary regimes in a number of other countries and organized armed aggression, which has become a true undeclared war against the Afghan people. The signs of raids by imperialist mercenaries are plain to see: murdered workers, peasants, women and children, teachers and activists of popular power, as well as barbarously demolished bridges and power lines, burnt houses and schools.

It is common knowledge what kind of nagative role in the life of the country was played by the criminal activity of the adventurist and traitor Amin, who elbowed his way to power by a fraudulent path. In conditions of intensified external aggression, his actions placed the people's gains in jeopardy.

But the healthy forces of Afghanistan, devoted to the cause of the revolution and supported by the will of the people, were able to master the situation and remove the dictatorial regime. Comrade Babrak Karmal, a prominent political figure in Afghanistan and one of the founders of the PDRA, became the head of the party and state.

The policy of the new leadership of the PDPA is imbued by political realism and profound vitality. An important part in the second phase of the April revolution lies in the work of expanding the social base of the revolutionary power, the speaker noted. The country's leadership has put forward the slogan: "Freedom to the People! Work to the Workless! Land to the Peasants!" Their realization responds to the interests of the workers and leads to the further solidarity and consolidation of ties between the party and the people.

The results of the April PDPA plenum and the documents approved by the plenum, the "basic principles of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan," and the PDPA Charter have been greeted with great interest in the Soviet Union. They contain the program for the second stage of the April revolution. The liquidation of all feudal remnants, the restriction of large-scale land holdings by landowners and the provision of land to peasants and farm laborers who possess little land, any upsurge in the national economy, raising the population's standard of living, development of education and the democratization of social and political life are in keeping with the basic interests of the Afghan people.

The industrious and courageous people of Afghanistan have achieved significant successes on the difficult path of struggle for the implementation of these noble aims. But ahead of you there are still quite a few difficulties--the huge and complex work of repelling imperialist aggression, of overcoming the resistance of the exploiter classes who have been overthrown and of implementing progressive socioeconomic reforms.

The Soviet people and all progressive mankind, M.V. Zimyanin continued, are following with profound respect and sympathy the struggle of the Afghan people for their national independence and for the construction of a new society based on the principles of social justice. No matter how much the imperialists and their agents persist in their hostile intrigues, we believe that with support from the homeland front, the revolutionary will and activity of the Afghan people, you will unfailingly overcome all difficulties and achieve victory in your heroic struggle.

The history of Soviet-Afghan relations, he went on to say, constitutes a model of good-neigborliness and cooperation on an equal footing, mutual respect and friendship. With the USSR's assistance a number of energy, industrial, transport and agricultural installations have been created in Afghanistan.

Following the victory of the April revolution relations between our countries have been raised to a qualitatively new level. The Soviet Union renders all-round aid to Democratic Afghanistan in the development of its economy, science and culture.

And when U.S. imperialist circles, together with their accomplices, unleashed aggression against the Afghan people, the Soviet Union, true to its international duty, at the request of the DRA Government sent a limited military contingent to Afghanistan with a view to rendering aid in repulsing the external aggression in full accordance with the UN Charter and the treaty of friendship, good neighborliness and cooperation between our two countries.

This internationalist action on the part of the USSR has not pursued and does not pursue the annexationist aims which imperialist propaganda attributes to it, such as the wish to lay hands on the petroleum resources of the Persian Gulf and to gain access to the warm southern seas. The Soviet troops came to Afghanistan as loyal, reliable friends in order to help the Afghan people in their noble struggle for the inviolability of the sacred borders of its motherland and for guaranteeing its sovereignty. The Soviet Union does not harbor any aggressive intentions against either Iran or Pakistan. It desires only the establishment of peace and stability in this region, the halting of aggression against friendly Afghanistan and the preservation of the traditional tranquillity on the Soviet-Afghan border, a border of friendship and good neighborliness.

Our party and state have pointed out more than once that ceaseless armed intervention and the far-reaching conspiracy of external reactionary forces have created a real threat that Afghanistan might lose its independence, turning it into an imperialist military bridgehead on the southern border of our country. Therefore, we could not fail to respond to the request of the government of friendly Afghanistan. To act otherwise would have meant abandoning Afghanistan to imperialism for dismemberment.

The forces of imperialism and their henchmen in Beijing and some other places are spewing out torrents of slander against the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. However, we did not expect approval from imperialist reaction. The Soviet Union has discharged its international duty appropriately, and will continue to do so in the future. The functions of the limited Soviet military contingents in Afghanistan at the request of its government are determined by agreement between the sides, proceeding from the task of protecting the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Afghanistan in the face of external aggression by forces directed by the United States, China and Pakistan. The Soviet units operate in full contact with Afghan troops. They are not fighting against the Afghan people.

As regards the conditions for their withdrawal from Afghanistan, these conditions are already well known. As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev has stated, the USSR will withdraw its military contingents from Afghanistan as soon as the reasons for their presence there are removed, and the Afghan Government no longer deems this presence indispensable. The United States is clamoring for the withdrawal of Soviet troops, while in fact it itself does everything to postpone this event--it is continuing and stepping up interference in the affairs of Afghanistan.

It is now abundantly clear, the speaker said in this context, that the departure of the U.S. ruling circles from the relaxation of international tension and towards aggravation of tension by no means began with the Afghan events. Afghanistan only served as a pretext for renewed whipping up of an anti-Communist, anti-Soviet hysteria. Washington embarked on the road leading back to the "cold war" well before the latest events in Afghanistan. All the actions of the U.S. ruling circles in building up military might in various parts of the world under the pretext that these allegedly represent a "sphere of U.S. interests" are embued with a reactionary spirit of hegemonism and colonial expansion. This is an imperialist annexationist policy which threatens the cause of peace, a policy for which there is no and can be no justification since it is so hostile to the interests of all peoples on earth.

The CPSU firmly and consistently implements a peaceloving Leninist foreign policy. Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, speaking at the presentation to him of the Lenin prize on 31 March this year, said: "All accumulated experience, the international situation as it takes shape and especially recent events, oblige us to keep the power dry, to be dogged and consistent in defending the cause of peace, and to bear in mind our historical responsibility for the destiny of the motherland and all mankind." These words give expression to the joint will of our whole party and the entire Soviet people. From our principled line of preserving and consolidating peace, backing all liberation and revolutionary forces, and struggling against the aggressive policy of imperialism we will never retreat!

Our country has now entered the responsible period of the conclusion of the 10th 5-Year Plan and preparations for the 26th party congress, which is to review the results of the great work that has been done in the past 5-year period, and determine the tasks of the party and people for the future.

M.V. Zimyanin went on to discuss the work done by the party and people of our country over the years of the 5-year plan period, of the achievements with which they are approaching the 26th Congress of the CPSU.

The Soviet people, he said, are fervent patriots and at the same time are convinced internationalists. They support unanimously and actively the domestic and foreign policy of our Leninist party and its Central committee headed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, the true continuer of the great cause of Lenin and an outstanding figure of the international communist and workers movement. This policy is aimed at further strengthening the fraternal unity and cohesion of the states of the socialist community and the union of world socialism with all peace-loving, progressive and revolutionary forces of the present era.

We are only a few days from the great festival of the working people of all countries--the day of international solidarity of the working people, 1 May, the speaker concluded. During these days our people and their thoughts are together with those to whom the interests of peace and social progress are dear, and together with you, dear Afghan friends. We highly evaluate the traditional friendship with the people of Afghanistan and we value the fraternal solidarity with the working people of your homeland and the people's revolutionary vanguard--the PDPA.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stated that the Soviet people and the CPSU will do everything possible so that the friendship between the USSR and the DRA will grow and strengthen and so that the comprehensive and equitable cooperation between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan will develop and deepen for the benefit of their peoples and in the name of peace, democracy and socialism.

Military Parade, Concert

LD271536 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 27 Apr 80

[Text] Kabul, April 27, TASS--The Afghan capital is in its holiday attire today. Seen everywhere are the tricoloured state flags of Afghanistan and red flags of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. The Afghan people is celebrating the second anniversary of the April revolution that overthrew the power of exploiters and opened the road to the creation of a new just society in Afghanistan. Tens of thousands of people gathered in Chaman-Hozuri square in the center of the capital. A military parade and a holiday demonstration of representatives of working people were held there. On the viewing platform were the General Secretary of the Peoples Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA] Central Committee, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA] Babrak Karmal, members of the Political Bureau of the PDPA Central Committee, other Afghan officials, a Soviet party and government delegation headed by Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M. Zimyanin and delegations from other friendly countries.

Opening the parade by troops of the Kabul garrison the DRA's Minister of National Defence M. Rafi' said that the glorious Afghan Armed Forces were worthily defending their motherland. No intrigues by the external and internal enemies of the DRA supported by imperialism of the United States, the Chinese hegemonists and reactionary circles of Pakistan, Egypt and Israel will be able to undermine the gains of the April revolution and of the Afghan working people. "The country's armed forces vigilantly stand guard over the gains of the April revolution", the minister stressed. "They will further worthily defend the independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan".

After the parade the square was filled by thousands of demonstrators in colourful national dress, carrying flowers and flags. Representatives of all sections of the population--workers of Kabul's industrial enterprises, peasants from nearby villages, employees of ministries and other government agencies, representatives of the intelligentsia, students of schools and establishments of higher education--greeted the Afghan revolution, the second stage of its development. They carried posters and streamers inscribed with the slogans "Long Live the Second Anniversary of the April Revolution", "We Will Frustrate American Imperialism's Sinister Plans", "We Will Defend the Gains of the Working People of Afghanistan, its Independence, National Sovereignty and Territorial Integrity", "The Reaction Will Fail".

After the demonstration a big concert by Afghanistan's best performers was held in Kabul's biggest cinema and concert hall Kabul Nandari. Performers from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and other countries also took part in the concert.

Soviet Delegation's Departure

LD280852 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 28 Apr 80

[Text] Kabul, April 28, TASS--The Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the Revolutionary Council and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan arranged on Sunday evening a grand reception on the occasion of the second anniversary of the April revolution in Afghanistan. Present at the reception were party and government delegations of friendly countries, including the Soviet Union's delegation headed by Mikhail Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Soviet party and government delegation, who attended the festivities on the occasion of the second anniversary of the Afghan revolution, emplaned for home today.

At Kabul International Airport the delegation were seen off by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, member of the Presidium of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Nur Ahmad Nur; member of the Political Bureau of the party Central Committee, Deputy Chairman of the Revolutionary Council, Deputy Prime Minister Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand; member of the Political Bureau of the Party Central Committee, member of the Revolutionary Council, Minister of Education, Chairman of the Afghan-Soviet Friendship Society Anahita Ratebzad; member of the party Central Committee, Foreign Minister Shah Muhammad Dost; member of the party Central Committee; Minister of Information and Culture 'Abdol Majid Sarboland and also the USSR Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Fikryat Tabeyev and other officials.

MOSCOW MEETING MARKS AFGHAN REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY

LD280755 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Apr 80 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Public Meeting"]

[Text] Soviet people welcome the Afghan people's efforts aimed at building a new society and carrying out progressive socioeconomic transformations in the country. They are in solidarity with the Afghan people's just struggle against internal counter-revolution and external reaction. This was stated at a public meeting marking the second anniversary of the April revolution in Afghanistan, held in Moscow on 22 April.

M.S. Daneshjo, Democratic Republic of Afghanistan charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR, stated that the Afghan working people are fully determined to rebuff imperialism's plans aimed at destroying the April revolution gains.

I.G. Kebin, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR ministers and other officials took part in the meeting.

Kapitonov Attends Daneshjo Reception

LD252247 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] On the occasion of the second anniversary of Afghanistan's April revolution, Daneshjo, Democratic Republic of Afghanistan charge d'affaires in the USSR, today gave a reception. Present at the reception were Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Kebin, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Katushev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other officials.

PRESS CONFERENCE BY AFGHAN COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY LEADER CITED

LD252026 Moscow TASS in English 2006 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Kabul, April 25, TASS--"I affirm that members of the Harakate Islamiye Afghanistan, Jamiate Islamiye parties and of other anti-Afghan bandit organisations set up abroad took part in the subversive actions staged in Kabul on February 22", Baratali Jafari, known by the nick-name Kasem, one of the former leaders of the counter-revolutionary party Harakate Islamiye Afghanistan, stated at a press conference which took place in the Afghan capital today. He underwent training in the conduct of subversive and terrorist activity at a special camp located in the territory of one of countries neighbouring on Afghanistan. He was infiltrated into Kabul and became the leader of a clandestine organisation.

"Covering their anti-people political goals by Islam, the above-mentioned parties, acting on instructions from international imperialism and reaction headed by the USA, draw into their ranks Afghans who found themselves outside their native land for various reasons. Their further fate is predetermined--military training at special camps and infiltration into Afghanistan for the conduct of the dirty war against their people. A consent to that is wrested by means of threats and intimidation", he pointed out further. "I have proof of how the enemies--U.S. imperialists, Chinese chauvinists and reaction of the region--trade in the name of Islam," B. Jafari emphasised.

The clandestine organisation which Jafari headed staged terrorist actions and distributed anti-government leaflets. Arms for the organisation members came from Pakistan.

The arms were mainly of U.S. and Chinese make. "I saw with my own eyes the marking on the arms," B. Jafari stated.

The terrorists' actions in the DRA's territory were directed from abroad. B. Jafari told journalists that he was in correspondence with the leaders of bandit groupings abroad and received from them money to organize anti-government activity and ammunition. He also received offers to deliver chemical bombs.

A statement by the DRA's security bodies was circulated at the press conference. It says that the undisguised interference by imperialist countries, Chinese chauvinists and reaction of the region in Afghanistan's internal affairs is going on. An example of such an interference was provided by the February developments in Kabul. The same is indicated by the present press conference and numerous material evidence which includes small arms, hand grenades and bottles with incendiary mixture, and anti-government publications.

"With a view to improving Afghanistan's relations with neighbouring countries and showing goodwill, the country's security bodies instructed B. Jafari not to disclose the name of the country and its cities, where camps for the training of counter-revolutionaries are located," the statement says.

ZIAUL HAQ REFUSES NORMALIZATION TALKS WITH AFGHANISTAN

LD252348 Moscow in English to South and Southeast Asia 1400 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Aleksander Korolev commentary]

[Text] Last week the Afghan Government put forward a number of constructive initiatives aimed at promoting peace and security in the region. The Afghan leadership reaffirmed its desire to develop friendly ties with neighboring countries and proposed talks with Pakistan for the purpose of normalizing relations between the two nations. Unfortunately, this proposal failed to meet a favorable response in Islamabad. According to Western news agencies, General Ziaul Haq actually refused to hold normalization talks. He told reporters in Islamabad that Pakistan would adhere to the resolution taken by the Islamic Conference at its January session, a resolution which speaks of the Babrak Karmal government as illegitimate.

This motivation for Pakistan's refusal to negotiate with Afghanistan can hardly be called reasonable because no neighboring country, or a group of countries, has the right to decide on the legitimacy of the Afghan Government, which has its own representative at the United Nations. This question is for the Afghan people to settle and these people give firm support to their present government and to its policies, determined by the April revolution. This support is expressed in the recent resolution passed by the leaders and elders of Pushtan tribes. Support for the Babrak Karmal government has also been expressed by the clergy, trade unions and youth organizations. This support is denied only by those who embarked on the road of counterrevolution way back in 1978 in their efforts to stop progressive social reforms in Afghanistan.

These people, the feudal landlords and other counterrevolutionaries who have fled to Pakistan, now make up the backbone of the forces which Washington and Beijing are using in their futile attempts to strangle the Agghan revolution.

President Ziaul Haq's reason for his refusal to begin talks lacks consistency also because it runs counter to the principles of neighborliness President Ziaul Haq avowed to respect a few months ago when he was seeking admittance to the nonaligned movement for his country. By refusing talks with Afghanistan, the Pakistani leadership actually shows its preference for maintaining tension in the region, tension which might evolve into a dangerous confrontation. This, however, can hardly be in the interests of the Pakistani people.

GROMKYO DISCUSSES IRAN, AFGHANISTAN AT PARIS PRESS CONFERENCE

LD261330 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1715 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Press conference held by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko in Paris on 25 April--recorded]

[Text] [Gromyko] To begin with, I will make a fairly short statement from my viewpoint on the talks which I have had with the French president and the French foreign minister and then I will endeavor to answer questions.

Although the visit has not been a lengthy one, nonetheless the French officials and I spent a fair number of hours in talks. Both sides were convinced that this visit and these talks were necessary.

I believe that it will be correct at the beginning to say that both sides have concluded that the talks and negotiations were useful. Indeed, there was a need to exchange opinions on questions concerning relations between France and the Soviet Union and also on questions of international policy and the international situation--maybe particularly on questions regarding the international situation and international policy.

In brief then on the exchange of views concerning bilateral relations: Both sides confirmed that France and the Soviet Union have traveled a long and fruitful path in the development of relations between them. What has already been accomplished in the development of relations between France and the Soviet Union is (?weighty) decisions and very important and substantial work. This applies both to the political sphere, the sphere of economic and trade links, the sphere of cultural cooperation and also to other spheres which relate to cooperation.

To back up this general topic of questions of economic and trade cooperation, it is necessary to note the fact that the outline drafts in the sphere of trade and economic links between France and the Soviet Union, as envisaged in the document signed last year by French President Giscard d'Estaing and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, are being successfully implemented, and what is more--I ask you not to be surprised--they are even being overfulfilled by our countries. There is every reason to say today that if both sides approach with an awareness of its importance the fulfillment of what has been outlined the plan will be implemented and may be overfulfilled in this sphere.

Further, the view of the Soviet side is that the edifice of cooperation between France and the Soviet Union is impressive and fairly stable, and we believe that if both sides strive for this, there is every reason for it to become even stabler than at present. Such grounds do exist.

Maybe some of those present are aware, but maybe some of them are not aware, that at present negotiations are being held between representatives of France and the Soviet Union on the possibility of concluding very important new contracts. These contracts concern important lines of economic links between France and the Soviet Union. We, the Soviet side, will do everything possible and everything we can to insure that these talks are brought to a successful conclusion.

We believe that this will be mutually beneficial--beneficial to France and beneficial to the Soviet Union. We are convinced that it will harm no one.

As for the international situation and international policy, many problems were touched upon in the course of the talks here. Let me begin with the fact that both sides confirmed, not for the first time, that the international situation has grown more complex and one might say, has been exacerbated. All are agreed on this and the Soviet leadership is agreed on this. The situation has become more complex and has been exacerbated. This is agreed by the state leadership of France and by the governments of other states. But, since it is a question of the need to improve the international situation in order to cope successfully with this task, it is necessary to have a correct idea of the reasons which have produced a complication and exacerbation of the international situation. When the question of these reasons was discussed in my talks with French officials, views to a great extent indeed coincided, but I would say that there are also differences in our views, at least on certain issues. But even during the exchange of views on those questions on which there is a difference in assessments of the situation and a difference in assessments of the reasons of the situation, the exchange of views took place in, I would say, a businesslike and generally friendly atmosphere. Both sides analyzed problems and corresponding attempts to find an explanation which would accord with reality and be truthful. This, I would say, it is fully appropriate to note.

We would like to see a reduction in the difference of the positions of the sides on those questions on which there is a difference in views between them. The more this difference is reduced, the better. We had the impression that the French president and the minister of foreign affairs, and consequently the French Government, would also like there to be a greater coincidence, and on foreign policy issues too the base to be broadened for cooperation between the two powers in their own interests and in the interests of peace and detente.

I mentioned detente; here I must say a few additional words on this subject. The relaxation of tension in the world has served for many years as a sort of pivot around which activity in the sphere of the foreign policies of France and the Soviet Union has to a great extent revolved. We believe that it ought to continue to be that pivot since the struggle for the relaxation of international tension and consequently for peace is something in which France and the Soviet Union have a vital interest, as do all other peoples. There are no people in the world which would like to live under tension, to live constantly under tension. There are none. Peace and the relaxation of tension is in the interests of everyone.

It was with satisfaction that during the conversations we, on this occasion, also stated that France stands, as it did before, for the relaxation of tension in the world, and that it does not intend to retreat from this line in foreign affairs. We, the Soviet Union, the Soviet leadership, our party and all the people also stand for detente in the world and we do not intend to retreat from this line. This has been said clearly, precisely and forcefully on several occasions, including in recent speeches by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev.

Those present may be promoted to ask a question. Very well. Yet what answer did the sides give to the question as to what are the basic reasons for the increase in tension and the aggravation of the international situation?

It is very difficult to answer that question in a few words, especially if one tries to explain the answer given by the other side. I will thus not undertake this task. I will tell you how we understand the reasons for the increase in tension in the world and what answer we give to this question. I will, of course, be brief.

The reasons, if one is to be objective, lie in the decision by the leading circles--this refers first and foremost to governments--which determine the foreign policies of countries to make a sharp turn in their international policies. It is difficult to name one particular fact or one particular event with which this turnabout in the policies of certain states is bound up. This turnabout is testified to by a number of facts, a number of events. The quantitative accumulation of these, of course, does not include their qualitative side, the qualitative description [as heard]. Yet, regardless of this difficulty, it is easy to find the basic stages and the basic facts which indicate foreign policy changes on the part of certain states. It is not difficult to find them.

I will name two or three such facts: Long before the so-called Afghanistan issue, when there was not even a mention of it, the NATO countries, primarily the United States, decided to initiate a new phase in the arms race. And at a time when responsible representatives of more than 100 of the world's states were taking the rostrum at the UN General Assembly to expound in turn their positions and their demands on the need to halt the arms race and for disarmament, at this very time, NATO which was holding a meeting in the U.S. capital a few hundred km from New York adopted a decision providing for a sharp increase in its military budget and for a sharp expansion of the arms race.

This fact is not stressed willingly by these same leaders of the powers which adopted a decision on increasing military budgets and the arms race. What is more they would like people to keep quiet about this fact. But it would not be right if we did not remind our people of this, too. The truth requires that things be explained as they are. And we have reminded peoples of other countries of this as much as we can. Why was it necessary to do this? To date consideratable successes have been achieved in the struggle for the relaxation of tension in the world. The pan-European conference had ended. Talks had been started up at a number of forums on these or other matters of disarmament and curbing the arms race. The matter of reaching agreement on the SALT II was making progress, and just at this time there was such a sharp turn toward escalating the arms race. To say that this was simply a big provocation in international politics would be to put it mildly. This term does not embrace the rich but negative content which this action of the NATO countries constitutes.

The question arises: What significance did that document have and still has which was adopted under the roof of the United Nations on matters of disarmament and stopping the arms race? Not very much. Not much because Washington, before this document saw the light of day and before it was voted for and approved at the United Nations, arranged its funeral knell to all intents and purposes.

According to Washington this matter of increasing military allocations and stepping up the arms race is snowballing, if one may phrase it thus. They speak almost all the time about further increases in military budgets and about further escalation in the arms race.

Here I want to point to a second fact: We have already noted this on more than one occasion but it is fully in order to point out yet again to representatives of the press, radio and television and through them to all people to whom they report on what we say: We want to draw attention to the fact that in Europe the situation has greatly deteriorated. It has deteriorated above all in connection with a specific act undertaken by such a major state as the United States using pressure--since this corresponds to the reality it is difficult to dispute this statement. This is the question of the deployment of new type of medium-range nuclear missile weapons. Why was it necessary to do this? For not long before the publication of this plan by Washington together with the NATO states the U.S. President stated when he met Leonid Ilich Brezhnev in Vienna that equality of a military strategic character exists between the Soviet Union and the United States, or equality between--as is often said, and he himself used such an expression--between the East and the West.

If there is equality then why, the question arises, must it be violated? After all, they opposed the violation of equality and we opposed violating it. Both sides agreed that the most reliable method of continuing to conduct matters in questions of weapons, above all military strategic weapons, was in such a way that the principle of equality would not be violated and would not be upset. Suddenly they began to say in Washington: No, there will be equality only when this plan as regards West Europe is implemented.

Here is another fact for you which explains to a great extent the exacerbation and complication of the whole international situation and particularly of the situation in Europe. Any statements that this plan was proposed because of some actions by the Soviet Union as regards one of the types of its weaponry are unconvincing, because these were normal actions which the NATO countries undertook on several occasions as regards their own type of weaponry and which incidentally are being carried out, as the military, the U.S. President, and Pentagon and other NATO governments and states are well aware.

The same question: Why was this complication necessary? Statements have been and are being made by specialists from the NATO member states that allege that both these steps are dictated by the aspiration of the Soviet Union to step up its arms and to overtake the NATO countries in the sphere of arms and that this allegedly represents a threat to peace in general and particularly to the NATO countries. There is not a grain of truth in this thesis. It is, as it were, a standard political diversion of the NATO countries. What threat stems from the Soviet Union if it insists that no single country should take the lead in the sphere of arms and that matters be conducted on a basis of equality? What threat can stem from the Soviet Union or from the Soviet Union together with its friends and allies? What threat is there if it does not stop submitting specific proposals aimed at curbing the arms race and at disarmament, and if it has stubbornly tried to achieve agreement being reached on the SALT II treaty on the basis of observing the principle of equality, and if it has systematically tried to convince the U.S. Government of the need to ratify the SALT II treaty? What threat can stem from the Soviet Union? Truth is not in the capitals of the NATO member states and has not been for a long time. If one is to give a name to the attempts to distort in this way the situation then this is deception of peoples and deception of public opinion.

The theory that the Soviet Union represents a threat to peace and is striving to leap ahead on the path of arms is a piece of deception. I could use even stronger language but will refrain from doing so.

I would like to dwell on one question in my statement, in case you forget to ask me this question later. Recently people in certain capitals, primarily those of the NATO countries, have begun to refer to the fact that the question of Afghanistan and the situation which has come about over Afghanistan is a substantial cause--and some people even try to assert that it is almost the major cause--of the exacerbation of the international situation. But, in the first place, as I have already mentioned, the sharp exacerbation of the situation was caused by the sharp action taken by the NATO countries in the sphere of the arms race, including action in the West European theater. In the second place, the Afghanistan question is being artifically blown up, its importance is being exaggerated, the real importance of this question, incorrect interpretations are systematically given to events and phenomena relating to Afghanistan. [sentence as heard] That is how things really stand.

The Soviet Union came to the aid of Afghanistan by sending in a limited contingent of its forces following a request by the Afghan leadership, a request that was expressed on more than one occasion after the April revolution. The Soviet Union sent in its contingents temporarily and stated clearly--and precise statements to this effect have been made on more than one occasion, among others, by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev personally--that when the reasons which caused the Afghan leadership to ask the Soviet Union to render military aid by sending in a limited number of its forces are removed, then the Soviet forces will be withdrawn. I would like to take this opportunity here of confirming that. This thought must reach every person in France and other countries who is interested in questions of foreign policy, including facts relating to Afghanistan and to the situation which has arisen over Afghanistan.

What are the reasons for the Afghan leadership's making the relevant request to the Soviet Union? The reason was an invasion, a foreign invasion on the territory of Afghanistan carried out mainly from the territory of Pakistan. We have stated this before. This is widely known throughout the world, although people in certain capitals pretended that they were unaware or as yet poorly aware of the fact of the invasion from the territory of Pakistan. But now hardly anyone disputes this fact. The Soviet Union knows it well. You must agree, it has good information about this at its disposal. It is not in our interests to speak inaccurately about this question, simply because it is impossible to do so: Any inaccuracy would be noticed and refuted. The Afghan leadership knows it well. Its army is waging a struggle against interventionists who have invaded from the territory of Pakistan, and no small amount of blood has been shed during that struggle.

A few days ago, about a week ago, the U.S. President made a statement to the effect that the rebels are apparently being given and will continue to be given U.S. aid. He talks about "rebels." He is referring to the invaders from the territory of Pakistan. Finally, whether those present know it or not--if they do not all know it then it will be made known to them--a few days ago President Zia of Pakistan said: Yes, invasions are occurring. But he said that the authorities in Pakistan are allegedly unable to stop these incursions. But we have never heard anything about the Pakistani president appealing to other states: Come and give me a hand and help us to stop these incursions. He realizes that such statements, completely unconvincing as they are, are not serious, when they say that Pakistan is unable to stop these incursions.

Those who stage invasions from Pakistani territory are many thousands of people, equipped with foreign arms, which are systematically supplied to them. They are trained in the handling of these weapons by instructors, and it is well known from which countries these come. I believe that even if I do not name them, it is very well known who they have to train them.

To use the language of the UN Charter, this aggression, the most real aggression, and this one circumstance alone justifies the appeal of the Afghan leadership to the Soviet Union for help. In conversations with the president of France and with the foreign minister we noted the fact that there are dozens of camps on the territory of Pakistan in which the formation, training and arming of contingents dispatched into the territory of Afghanistan to fight against the regime in Afghanistan and against the lawful leadership Afghanistan take place.

We handed over precise indications and names of these camps to the Government of India not so long ago, during our visit to Delhi. If this is known to anyone at all then it should be very well known to the United States. Why is all this being done?

The behavior of the leadership of Pakistan greatly puzzles us. Does it really consider that it is in Pakistan's interest to live at daggers drawn, as it were, with its neighboring state of Afghanistan, to live in a state of permanent hostility? Meanwhile there remains full awareness here that they cannot change the state set-up in Afghanistan, that there can be no question of depriving that country of its independence. They know all this full well. It is thus incomprehensible to see how the Pakistani leadership envisages the conditions for future coexistence. There is an opportunity to solve the question in Afghanistan and the situation which has developed around Afghanistan on the basis of halting the aggression against Afghanistan, of halting the incursions from outside and all forms in general of intervention in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan. Only in this case will the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops be placed on a reliable basis. We have said that this withdrawal would be implemented when aggression against Afghanistan is stopped.

All talk to the effect that first of all the Soviet troops must be withdrawn, then we will see, and then there will be discussion on solving the other questions is, of course, a mirage. Talk in these terms is a waste of time and energy. It is unrealistic. Given the difference in evaluations of the situation in Afghanistan and the question of Afghanistan between the Soviet Union and France or, to be more accurate, the French leadership, it is all the same fair to require that it be noted that the statements by the president of France, including those which have been made publicly, do contain positive elements. Which elements are these?

He says that no one ought to interfere in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan, that the social questions and the question of the social regime of Afghanistan are domestic questions. They have to be resolved by the Afghan people themselves. Quite correct. The president makes a point that Afghanistan must be a nonaligned state. The word "neutral" is much used, but one should say precisely "a nonaligned state," because this is a legitimized international category, especially following the formation of the movement of nonaligned states. We also proceed from the premise, and the Afghan leadership itself proceeds from that premise, that Afghanistan must be a nonaligned state. As you see, it is hard to find any difference in this regard, in connection with these statements, between our position and the position of the French leadership, as it was expressed to us.

The question of the withdrawal of the troops must be set in context, which includes also with respect to time, and the correct causal relationship between statements needs to be observed. The troops will be withdrawn if the aggression is stopped and peaceful relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and between Iran and Afghanistan are established, and if all this is properly guaranteed. On this I end my statement.

Any questions?

[Question] Mr Minister, you are aware that this morning the Americans attempted to free the hostages being held in the Iranian capital by military means. Could you comment on this event?

[Answer] When I first heard about this early this morning I did not believe it--I almost did not believe it--but I was given a repeat report which confirmed that an operation was undertaken. What then can I say? I can say that we are against any actions of a military, and in general, of a violent nature by the United States or anyone whomever against Iran. We resolutely condemn such measures.

[Question] Soviet television. During your conversations in Paris was the question posed of a conference on military detente in Europe? Is there any progress on this question?

[Answer] Yes, it did arise, and I must remark that both France and the Soviet Union are in favor of such a conference taking place; we express satisfaction in this regard. This refers to a conference on--to be more precise--questions of measures of trust. This is a very important conference. We have, well, an understanding with the French side on the point that such a conference on measures of trust must be followed by another conference on questions of disarmament in Europe, and there is mutual understanding on this question. I cannot, of course, say that the path leading to these is a short one, but the fact of mutual understanding with France is one which ought to be noted positively. I can say confidently on behalf of our country, of the Soviet Union, and of the socialist states in the Warsaw Pact, that we have struggled and will struggle for halting the arms race and as a minimum for applying the brakes to this arms race, and that we will struggle for disarmament. We have submitted many proposals on questions of disarmament. We will continue to submit proposals for the consideration of other states. There is no more pressing or more important problem facing mankind. As regards other states it is appropriate to state once again that their policies are not aimed at halting the arms race and at disarmament, although from time to time representatives of these states do make statements in favor of disarmament. But there is a great distance between their statements and their real actions, and I have already directed the attention of those present to some of these real actions.

I would have liked to make an optimistic statement. I would have liked to do so very much. But most regrettably the situation does not justify this. Well, we are far from giving into the moods of fatalism. Fatalism is alien to our foreign policy. We consider that the requirements and fundamental interests of the peoples require a struggle for disarmament; sooner or later, this problem must be solved. Obviously it will be solved in stages. Much will depend on how public forces occupying correct positions will wage their struggle and on how steadfastly they will wage this struggle. Above all, of course, it depends on those people who have their hands on the helm of policy, especially foreign policy. That is how I would answer this question.

[Question] Is a visit by Mr Brezhnev to Paris being planned?

[Answer] As is well-known, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev was invited by President Giscard d'Estaing. During our talks here in Paris the president recalled this invitation. On behalf of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev I said that naturally Leonid Ilich well remembers this invitation and at an appropriate time will be pleased to make a visit. As for the time for a possible visit, this question is subject to additional discussion and agreement between the sides, obviously through diplomatic channels.

Gentlemen and comrades, I am satisfied by my meeting with you. Let me leave here my best wishes and express the hope that the results of the press conference will be reported objectively in the press and by other information media. Thank you very much, until we meet again!

GROMYKO ARRIVES HOME FROM VISIT TO FRANCE

LD251642 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, who had been visiting Paris at the invitation of the French Government, returned home today. Meeting Comrade Gromyko at the airport in Moscow were Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politbruo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

REPORTAGE, COMMENT ON REACTION TO U.S. RESCUE ATTEMPT

Protests in 'Political Circle's

LD251824 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Excerpts] The U.S. administration's armed provocation against Iran has aroused shap public protests in the countries of West Europe and concern and condemnation in political circles.

Bonn--The West German news agency, DPA, reports that the FRG federal chancellor was unpleasantly surprised by the reports about the Americans' attempts to free the hostages. Boelling, the FRG Government's official spokesman, declared that this action was completely unexpected by the chancellor and the entire ministerial cabinet.

Paris--An official spokesman of the Elysee Palace has stated that President Valery Giscard d'Estaing of the French Republic and the French Government were not informed about the U.S. action in Iran. The influential Paris newspaper LE MONDE writes today that the steps taken by the United States in Iran mean that foreign confidence in the United States will be considerably harmed. The newspaper says that this incident will also have repercussions on President Carter's reputation.

Rome--An Italian Foreign Ministry statements stresses that the Italian side spoke out resolutely against the use of force to solve the problem of the hostages. Calamandrei, the chairman of the communist group of deputies in the European Parliament and a representative of the Italian Communist Party, called the U.S. action in Iran irresponsible and adventurist.

London--A large group of Labor MP's today submitted a draft Commons resolution which says in particular; We are opposed to the use of force to release the hostages and are opposed to any military actions which could escalate into a major world conflict. The parliamentarians demanded that the British Government stop cooperation with the United States in solving the hostage problem if the White House does not give categorical assurance that it will not undertake any military measures whatsoever against Iran. (Howell), a Labor MP, has condemned the U.S. armed provocation against Iran, saying that this action is a flagrant violation of international laws. A special statement of the General Council of the Scottish Trade Union Confederation adopted at its 83d congress stresses that U.S. adventurist policy can only lead to a worsening of the position of the U.S. hostages in Tehran. The document notes that the British Government must make it absolutely clear to the United States that Britain will not allow itself to be drawn into this conflict. President Carter must not increase the danger of an outbreak of nuclear war in the interests of his own election campaign.

Dublin--Sean MacBride, a winner of the International Lenin Peace Prize and a prominent politician and public figure in Ireland, said that the consequences of the U.S. armed incursion [vtorzheniye] onto Iranian territory looks threatening for the destiny of the world. He pointed out that the aggressive U.S. actions will unquestionably arouse wide-ranging protests throughout the world.

Goncharov on Allies' Position

LD251654 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 25 Apr 80

["Encouragement of Washington's Ventures"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, April 25, TASS--TASS political news analyst Vladimir Goncharov writes:

The reckless military venture which was undertaken by Washington against Iran in breach of all norms of international law and which confronted the world with a threat of the creation of a new hotbed of war, illumined as a flash of lighning the essence of the present foreign-policy course of the United States. It showed the immense danger of such a course of U.S. imperialism to all countries of the world, including that to U.S. allies and partners for military political blocs. By using the levers of the notorious "Atlantic solidarity" the United States makes its partners not only approve of its dangerous actions but also repeat and duplicate them. As the Luxembourg session of the EEC Council showed, the USA's NATO allies follow the White House and support Washington's dangerous anti-Iranian course. They decided to reduce EEC countries' diplomatic personnel in Tehran and the Iranian Embassy staff in West European capitals, introduced restrictions upon the issuance of visas to Iranian citizens, and renounced the conclusion of new export agreements with Iran. Moreover, sacrificing their own interests, they threatened Iran with an imposition of embargo on the purchase of Iranian oil.

However, to all appearances, this is not enough for the White House. Literally, not a day passes without a peremptory shout from Washington to West European partners of the USA. The day before yesterday it was Brzezinski who in an interview with the French newspaper LE FIGARO and the weekly PARIS-MATCH demanded that the West European partners cease grumbling at and criticising the U.S. policy with regard to Iran, and support the policy more actively. Yesterday the allies were addressed by the U.S. President himself who demanded from them stronger and more rapid actions against Iran. Following Carter and echoing him on the same day was former State Secretary Kissinger who accused West European countries of insufficient solidarity with Washington. It should be noted that all those demands are made already after the Luxembourg session when, as the FRG's Foreign Minister Genscher put it, the Carter administration should be content with the decisions adopted by the EEC. But, judging by everything, Washington is demanding from its allies more than that. Namely what? An exact answer can be given to this question today. The USA is now demanding approval of and support for its new step along the lines of escalation of anti-Iranian actions--an approval of and support for the U.S. military venture against Iran.

But who knows, maybe Washington will demand still more. It cannot be ruled out at all that, following the "Atlantic logic," the White House will be demanding from its allies not only applause but also a dispatch of British, West German, and other military landing forces to Iran...

It is significant that official spokesmen of West European countries--participants in NATO--are declining to comment on the present military venture of the USA. One can perhaps understand them. What can they say when, in accordance with the practice that has been established in relations between senior and junior Atlantic partners, Washington not only failed to consult with its NATO allies but also deliberately concealed from them the piratic concept of an air attack on Iran. This had to be admitted at the Brussels headquarters of NATO. However, the leaders of West European countries will not be able to keep silent infinitely: They will have to determine their position. The nearest future will show whether they will continue to support Washington, encouraging it to new reckless ventures extremely dangerous to the cause of universal peace. One thing is clear: Approving and supporting such a course of the USA, they assume a great responsibility.

Implications for Turkey

LD262102 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1400 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Unattributed commentary: "U.S. War Preparations in the Middle East--and Turkey"]

[Text] Dear listeners: The report on the U.S. military operation aimed at liberating the American hostages in Tehran has been received as a new manifestation of the present Washington administration's dangerous policy of adventurism. At this point it is not clear from which country or from what base under the control of the Pentagon or NATO the two aircraft carrying American soldiers and which crashed on Iranian territory took off. One can imagine that not even the leaders, let alone the people, of such a country would be aware of the fact.

There are not a few instances in the history of America's relations with its minor partners where countries that have bowed to Washington's pressure and allowed American bases to be established in their country have been dragged into the dangerous adventures of the Pentagon against their will. Our listeners will no doubt recall the case of the U.S. U-2 spy plane shot down over the Soviet Union. The Turkish administration of the time learned that the spy plane had taken off from the American base at Incirlik only after the plane had been shot down.

In recent months, the Pentagon has been feverishly preparing military bases in various parts of the world, particularly in the Middle East. There is sustained military activity on the one hand, and, on the other, sabre rattling and threats against Iran. American armed forces have been provided with military aid and naval bases in Kenya and Oman. Tel Aviv and Cairo have offered their services to the American war-makers.

Washington has also succeeded in imposing its so-called joint defense cooperation treaty on Ankara. As you know, under this treaty 26 bases on Turkish territory are leased to America for a period of 5 years. A guarantee has been given that these bases will not be used outside NATO purposes and that they will remain under the control of the Turkish military. But those Turkish public circles who know the value of U.S. guarantees very well could not be pacified. Representatives of the country's democratic circles have repeatedly expressed serious concern and anxiety over the dangers that the [word indistinct] of American and NATO bases can engender. The adventurism of the Carter administration's policy, taken together with the magnitude of the military preparations of the Pentagon, is proof that such concern is not without foundation.

UK PREPARED TO SEND MILITARY FORCE TO PERSIAN GULF

LD251315 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] London, 25 April, TASS--The Conservative Government of Great Britain will be ready to send British military detachments to the Persian Gulf area if President Carter should decide to have recourse to "military actions" against Iran. This was announced here following a Cabinet session held yesterday which was devoted entirely to considering issues connected with the crisis in American-Iranian relations. THE DAILY MAIL recalls in this connection a recent statement by Defense Secretary F. Pym, who announced the "existence in Britain of special detachments which can proceed to carry out their duties with the minimum delay." These are the "swift reaction combat group," the establishment of which was provided for in the White Paper on Defense published by the Conservative government some time ago.

KHOMEYNI CALLS U.S. RESCUE MISSION 'FOOLISH ATTEMPT'

Hostages Fate Described

LD251836 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 25, TASS--Ayatollah Khomeyni said today that the U.S. military would not have found any single hostage alive in the building of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran, if they had managed to reach the embassy building.

He described the former U.S. Embassy in Iran as "a spies' nest". Ayatollah Khomeyni also said that neither himself nor the Iranian Government will be able to bear responsibility for the fate of the U.S. hostages if the United States undertakes yet another "foolish attempt" to rescue them by military means.

'Display Vigilance, Mobilize'

LD252152 Moscow TASS in English 2106 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 25, TASS--Iranian leader Ayatollah Khomeyni addressed a message today to the Iranian people. He said that although the U.S. administration says that a total of eight persons had allegedly died under the abortive attempt to free the hostages the "evidence showed and we know there are more. There are dozens of them who have lost their lives and dozens are wandering in the wilderness" in the Deshte-Kevir desert. He said that the allegations that all the Americans had been evacuated are belied by the reports reaching us.

Carter must know, Khomeyni went on to say, that if this group had attacked the nest of espionage there would be no sign of them or the spies by now and they would all have gone to hell. Carter must know that an attack on Iran will cause an automatic discontinuance of the oil supplies and will set the whole world against him. Carter must know that this stupid act will affect the American people in such a manner that his adherents will become his opponents. By this action he has deprived himself of the hope to be reelected as U.S. President--Carter has demonstrated by this that he has lost the ability to reason and that he cannot lead such a big country as America.

Stressing the readiness of the Iranian people for self-sacrifice, Khomeyni said that the Iranian Army and the security forces have all the advanced weapons which were supplied by the United States for transforming Iran into its base.

The leader of the Islamic revolution called on the people to display vigilance and mobilise all efforts for a battle with the enemies of Iran. He instructed the army, the gendarmerie, the police and the guards of the Islamic Revolution to be in a state of combat readiness stressing the need to mobilise the civilian population for defence.

I am warning Carter that if he commits another stupid act, we won't be able to control the youth and the courageous Moslems now holding the nest of espionage and he will be personally responsible for the lives of the spies.

QOTBZADEH DENUNCIATION OF U.S. ATTACK QUOTED

LD251735 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] New York, April 25, TASS--"A clear act of invasion by American Armed Forces into Iranian territory," "an extremely hostile action"--with these words Iran's Foreign Minister S. Qotbzadeh has described the adventurist attack by Washington.

In an interview with the NBC television company he said this attempt became a natural continuation of the anti-Iranian policy of the Carter administration. First, the minister said, the White House imposed economic sanctions upon us, then severed diplomatic relations and began applying strong pressure on other countries to follow suit and now again it has resorted to a military action. After what has happened now one can expect "anything" from the United States.

S. Qotbzadeh has called on the American people to condemn the actions of the Washington administration which are fraught with a serious danger to the lives of many people and jeopardize peace in the world. These actions, he stressed, are reminiscent of Hitler's occupation of Austria.

'Criminal Actions' Condemned

LD261448 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 26, TASS--Sadeq Qotbzadeh, Iranian minister for foreign affairs, stated in an interview with a Tehran radio correspondent that Iran "sharply condemns the U.S. administration's hostile action and at the same time remains cool and firm in the face of the actions taken because of hot temper or foolishness."

"By its criminal actions, he emphasised, the USA not only jeopardised the lives of the hostages but also, according to its own admission, lost eight people. In principle that was an action caused by the internal political problems of America and the position in which Carter found himself after the primaries in Pennsylvania." "The fact that for the sake of presidential armchair, he is capable of committing any crime is indicative of an utter unsoundness of his claims to 'humaneness' and 'benevolence,'" Qotbzadeh said.

"The worst thing is, he pointed out, that European countries also found themselves in the role of followers of the U.S. domestic policy. This is regrettable."

"There is no doubt, the miniser went on to say, that America's plans to aggravate the situation in Iran are extremely extensive. Therefore our people should be particularly vigilant in the face of intrigues of U.S. imperialism and international Zionism."

"We shall not tolerate a recurrence of such actions, and in the event of such an attempt we shall issue an order to our naval ships to open fire. Let America know that .t is confronted with people who are ready to repulse its criminal actions at all costs. Let the countries of our region know, too: If they do not take a resolutely stand with regard to the USA, the situation will turn against them."

BANI-SADR COMMENTS AT TEHRAN PRESS CONFERENCE

Bodies of Dead To Be Returned

ID270510 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] President Bani-Sadr has told a news conference in Tehran that Iran will return the bodies of the eight dead American commandos to the United States without any conditions. The men were killed in the (?breakup of the) abortive commando raid into Iran. The president said Iran would ask the nonaligned countries to assemble at a special conference so that Iran could seek their support against American imperialism. He confirmed reports that the American hostages had been transferred from the buildings of the former United States Embassy in Tehran to various locations outside the city.

Call for Nonaligned Help

ID271645 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 27 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 27, TASS--President Bani-Sadr of Iran said at a press conference here that "Washington's actions are guided not by a desire to free the hostages but by a desire to destroy our revolution. Carter couldn't care less for the hostages. By his desperate actions he is trying to aggravate international tension and to whip up psychosis in the United States. He is looking for pretexts for armed interventions and aggressions and is pushing the world to a global catastrophe."

"The American administration will never put up with the existence of a free and independent state--Iran--in this area and will not give up its plots against our revolution", he said.

The president said that Iran had no intention of complaining in the United States against the aggressive actions of the United States. "But we will demand the convocation of an extraordinary conference of representatives of non-aligned countries and ask them to take measures to give Iran material assistance in its resistance to the American plot".

MUSLIM STUDENTS' STATEMENT ISSUED IN TEHRAN

ID252106 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 25, TASS--Student followers of Ayatollah Khomeyni's line who hold in captivity the American hostages have published a statement here which says, in part: The world has seen that the United States deceives even its partners, forcing them thereby to join its economic blockade of Iran and threatening to resort to military action. At the same time it sends a task force equipped with modern armaments to Iran for subversive actions.

The students said that if the United States attempted similar actions again, those who did it would find their graves in Iranian soil.

Hostages Moved From Embassy

ID262024 Moscow TASS in English 1957 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 26, TASS--The personnel of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran has been sent from the capital to different cities of the country. A statement to this effect was made on the radio by the students, who are keeping the American hostages. This measure, as was reported, has been taken in order to foil a repetition of Washington's attempts to free by force the personnel of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran.

IRANIAN AMBASSADOR WARNS OF CONSEQUENCES OF ACTION

ID261955 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 26 Apr 80

["Determination of the Iranian People"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, April 26, TASS--Mohammad Mokri, ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the USSR, described as a reckless action the U.S. armed provocation against his country. In answer to the call of Leader of the Iranian Revolution Imam Khomeyni, the Iranian people is determined to parry the U.S. aggression against Iran, the ambassador said, addressing the emergency press conference for Soviet and foreign newsmen here. Mohammad Mokri said that Iran would not free the American hostages until the USA met the demand of the Iranian Government for the extradition of "criminal" shah. If such actions of the USA repeat, we will not be able to guarantee the safety of the hostages, the ambassador stressed. By its action, M. Mokri pointed out, the USA jeopardised peace all over the world. As far as we are concerned, we are ready to repell any aggressive actions by the USA, although we are aware that the forces are not equal. We are confident, however, that on our side are all peace-loving forces of the world.

ARMY DIVISION IN KHUZESTAN PUT ON ALERT

ID262026 Moscow TASS in English 1959 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 26, TASS--According to a report of Tehran radio, the 92nd Division of the Iranian Army stationed in Khuzestan Province on the shore of the Persian Gulf has been put on high alert. Planes of the Iranian Airforce, the report says, are ready to take off immediately in case of violation of Iran's air space.

MOSCOW PERSIAN COMMENTS ON HOSTAGE RESCUE ATTEMPT

NC251729 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Unattributed commentary reviewing U.S. press on Iranian incidents]

[Text] The adventurous policy of Carter's administration toward Iran and especially its policy of the use of force, have caused concern not only among America's many social classes, but also among those American senators who have not lost their senses. Some of the American legislators who express concern ask the White House's war-mongering policy seriously insist these days that Carter told immediate discussion with the Congress. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a letter to the secretary of state, writes: The law does not allow the President to decide on his own on war moves. In a disturbed tone it is recalled in this letter that in his remarks the President refers more and more to the possibility of armed activities in connection with the Iranian crisis.

The ink on the newspapers which reported this was not yet dry when the world witnessed America's impudent armed action, which defies all international laws and regulations. America executed a venture which could have resulted in the death of thousands of innocent people and the appearance of a seat of war in the Persian Gulf area. On President Carter's orders American paratroopers landed in a remote area of Iran. These forces were to prepare the necessary ground for the rescue by force of the American hostages in Tehran.

According to many observers, with this new and dangerous venture the President uselessly tried to prove himself a strong leader in the country and to stay in the White House for a second term at any price. To reach these arbitrary political objectives, Carter resorted to acts which could have resulted in mass bloodshed and the deaths of the hostages, for whose freedom he is allegedly working so hard.

These adventurist acts have been condemned by many logical people. Mrs Barbara Rosen, wife of one of the American hostages, in an interview with correspondents said that she definitely opposes any type of military intervention by the United States in Iran. She said: I am prepared to wait a few more months for my husband's release and a military breakout should be prevented. She added: I prefer to wait a few more months rather than for more lives to be taken. While expressing concern over the fact that other countries could also be drawn into the military conflict between the United States and Iran, she referred to the need for a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

But apparently this is exactly what does not please President Carter. In the opinion of observers the abortive provocation in Iran showed once more the fact that the American President is not concerned in the least about the destiny of his country's citizens and is prepared to sacrifice their lives for the sake of insuring his personal interests. But as far as the destiny of the 35-million Iranian population is concerned, there is nothing to be said.

Savchenko: 'Adventurism' in Iran

NC261807 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 26 Apr 80

[Text] Dear listeners: Our commentator Igor Savchenko writes on the military action the United States attempted on the pretext of freeing the American hostages from Tehran:

All peace-loving social circles of the world learned with great rage and hatred of this new adventurism by Washington which could have caused the deaths of thousands of innocent people and the emergence of a seat of war in the Persian Gulf region.

Iran's Foreign Minister Sadeq Qotbzadeh described this attempt as an act of war against Iran. Referring to sources close to the CIA, AFP reports that this plan included an attack by a group of CIA agents dressed in Iranian uniforms on the former American Embassy building in Tehran and the use of lethal gases against the students who are guarding the American hostages. Apparently war in Tehran's streets was not discounted either. In other words a very large-scale military adventure had been prepared.

But, as has become common in the acts of the Carter administration, Carter deemed it unnecessary to inform not only U.S. allies, but even the U.S. Congress and Senate of his country of this act.

In general, we are dealing with adventurism raised to the level of national policy. The indicative aspect of this act is the extreme guile and hypocrisy which Washington showed. Plans for these moves started long ago, last November. The methods of attacking the American Embassy and disarming or killing the guards, or even war with the Tehran inhabitants who would run to the aid of the students, had been practiced with great precision. During this time Carter and his associates constantly paid great lip service to the desire to solve the hostage issue peacefully, to respect Iran's independence and even to friendly intentions toward Iran and Islam. Now, after all these babblings, can even one more word uttered by Washington be believed? Or let us look at Carter's recent remarks on the disgraceful failure of his latest anti-Iranian adventure which was carried out on his orders. In his press conference Carter crooned about the humanitarian objectives on this adventure, aggressive and militarily subversive on the territory of independent Iran, and said that these military activities were aimed at decreasing international tensions. Is such charlatanry not the zenith of guile, hypocrisy and duplicity? It becomes clear that the U.S. President had prepared death for tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of Iranians, merely on humanitarian grounds. It seems that when the U.S. President endangers peace in the Middle East, he is sympathizing with decreasing international tensions.

The incidents which took place in Kavir-e Lut near Tabas prove that in its activities, the Carter administration is increasingly adventurist and irrational. As Ayatollah Khomeyni has said: Carter showed that he has lost the ability to think, and anything, anywhere should be expected from such a government.

Therefore the flood of rage which has overtaken the entire world on Washington's new anti-Iranian attempt is completely logical and legitimate.

Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko strongly condemned this attempt, saying: The Soviet Union opposes any military attempt and in general any violent act by America or any other source against Iran. The Indian Foreign Ministry condemned America's military machinations against Iran and stressed that this attempt might further aggravate tension, create danger and threaten the region's peace and stability.

Concern and fear have overtaken many U.S. allies as well because they do not know where else Washington's adventurist and foolish policy can lead. This foolish attempt has created a situation in the United States itself that according to ASSOCIATED PRESS is described with the words surprise, shock and amazement.

But the reply given by the Iranian people to the attack by the U.S. Armed Forces is increased vigilance and the mobilization of force to fight the enemy. The leader of Iran's revolution, Ayatollah Khomeyni, has instructed the army, the gendarmerie, the police force and the Islamic Guards corps to be in a state of combat readiness and stressed the need to mobilize civilians for defense.

Dear listeners: Washington will be completely unable to terrify Iran, which is supported by all the world's progressive forces. As we see Iran is prepared to give a strong and silencing reply to imperialism's offensives and plots against its independence and freedom.

PEOPLE OF TEHRAN EXPRESS 'INDIGNATION' AT RAID

LD251948 Moscow TASS in English 1933 GMT 25 Apr 80

[Text] Tehran, April 25, TASS--The report on the piratic action of the USA, which tried by means of military force to free the staff of the U.S. Embassy held hostage by the Iranian students in Tehran, was taken with indignation in Iran. Thousands of residents of the capital went into the streets to express indignation over the bandit raid attempt made on direct orders from President Carter. Mass demonstrations took place outside the U.S. Embassy building. Reports about the failure of the U.S. action were met by shouts "Down With Carter!" "Down With U.S. Imperialism!" A spokesman of the students--the followers of the course of Ayatollah Khomeyni--stated that a decision on the further fate of the U.S. Embassy staff will be taken by the students after they get a more detailed information on the U.S. raid. Iran's military authorities called on the population of towns and villages situated near the location where the two U.S. aircraft collided to detain the U.S. commandos remaining on Iranian soil.

U.S. 'RESCUE' PLANES TOOK OFF FROM EGYPTIAN AIRPORT

LD251634 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 25 Apr 80

["From the Egyptian Bases"--TASS headline]

[Text] Beirut, 25 April (TASS)--The U.S. adventure of "rescuing" the hostages in Tehran started at one of the military airports of Egypt. According to today's reports of Western agencies, a U.S. heavy transport plane took off yesterday from the Egyptian air base located west of Cairo at 2200 and took a course for Iran. It landed in Bahrain for refueling.

At the same time, the reports contain, as a confirmation, a reference to monitored conversation of the land-based airport controls in a number of Near Eastern countries.

Egyptian officials have attempted to refute any involvement of Egypt in the American action. A representative of the U.S. Embassy in Cairo said, in his turn, that he could neither confirm nor refute these reports. Nonetheless, the Israeli paper MA'ARIV published today materials of its [word indistinct] correspondent, written prior to the unsuccessful American operation that USAAF planes recently resumed the use for their own purposes of the military airport at Qina (upper Egypt) and turned it into their own "operational base."

"C-130 transport planes landed at Qina and unloaded electronic equipment and reconnaissance planes with electronic apparatus also landed," the newspaper report says. "Such activity, obviously indicates the Americans' intention to carry out some kind of operation in the area, possible with relation to Iran." The report stresses that these actions were going on "with the full cooperation of the Egyptian Air Force."

Cairo, 25 April, TASS--The Cairo newspaper AL-AKHBAR in its turn today confirmed the possibility of the use of Egyptian military bases by the U.S. air force. As the newspaper's Washington correspondent writes, "reconnaissance aircraft of the AWACS system have returned to the Near East and will possibly carry out air patrols there in which Egyptian specialists and flyers will take part." In January, as is known, several AWACS system planes were located at airforce bases in upper Egypt. The Cairo press admitted also that subunits of the U.S. and Egyptian air forces then carried out joint maneuvers over the Red Sea.